V. S. Semyonov

Nations and Internationalism

Progress Publishers
Moscow

Translated from the Russian by *Lenina Ilyitskaya*
Edited by *Liv Tudge*
Designed by *Victor Korolkov*

В. С. Семенов

О НАЦИЯХ И ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛИЗМЕ
На английском языке

First printing 1979

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1979
English translation © Progress Publishers 1979

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

10504-011
С———— 47-79
014(01)-79

0302030200

CONTENTS

Page	
5	Introduction
13	Chapter One. Consolidation Processes in World History and Their National Aspects
16	At the Dawn of Human Society
22	At the Root of Class Antagonisms
28	National Consolidation Processes in Western Europe
43	Consolidation Among the Slavs
52	Consolidation Processes in Asia, Africa and the American Continent
70	Chapter Two. The Awakening of Nations and the Rise of National Movements. The Internationalism of the Working Class
76	Oppressed and Oppressor Nations
85	Imperialism: a World System of Colonial Oppression
96	Internationalism: the World Outlook and Class Policy of the Proletariat
115	Chapter Three. The Socialist Brotherhood of the Peoples of Russia
118	The Voluntary Union of Nations
133	The International Movement of Solidarity with Soviet Russia
136	The October Revolution and the National Liberation Movement
149	The Establishment of the Soviet Union, the Birthplace of Socialist Nations and Nationalities
166	Chapter Four. The Peoples' Liberation Struggle Against Fascism
167	The Soviet Union's Striving for Collective Security
170	Proletarian Solidarity Against Fascism
173	Hitler's Plans to Exterminate and Enslave the Peoples

179 The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet People (1941-1945)
190 The Anti-Fascist Resistance Movement
198 Chapter Five. Developed Socialism and Internationalism
205 The Achievement of Real Equality Among the Soviet Nations and Nationalities
212 The International Unity of the Soviet Peoples
229 The Soviet People, a Social and International Community
238 Chapter Six. Internationalism and the World Revolutionary Process
238 The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism—the Main Characteristic of the Epoch
246 The Fraternal Socialist Community
264 The Revolutionary Working-Class Movement
275 The Peoples' National Liberation Movement
287 Conclusion
291 Bibliograph
302 Index

INTRODUCTION

As can be seen from its title, this book is devoted to the interrelated subjects of nations and internationalism. Each of these can, of course, be an object of separate study, yet we feel that they appear in a new perspective when viewed together, revealing new features which are of urgent contemporary interest. The ideological, political and historical interrelation of these subjects, and the socio-economic basis of their relationship can only be understood if we regard them as a whole.

In this book the author sets out to give a theoretical exposition of these issues, discussing them in the context of world history and of the diverse forms of the human community.

Extraordinarily high dynamism in every field of human activity is the hallmark of the present epoch, and internationalisation of productive forces and of economic, foreign, political, cultural and other relations is one of the most significant characteristics of our times.

Developing consolidation processes in world history are general and consistent and are based—for all the great diversity of the specific forms and life styles of individual human communities—on a succession of socio-economic formations. Pre-socialist consolidation processes stem, in the final analysis, from the conflict between the productive forces and relations of production on which this succession depends. At a certain stage of history which, however, does not everywhere occur simultaneously, there arise such human communities as ethnic groups, nationalities and nations.

Before attaining its present stage, mankind passed through fairly extensive periods of pre-tribal, pre-class development, each considerably longer than the next. The formation of national communities is an intricate and manifold process involving all strata and classes of society.

In considering the historical and social aspects of the question of nations and internationalism we are able to define scientifically the stage at which national communities emerge—usually in the period of late feudalism, while the socio-economic foundation of nations is provided by the capitalist relations, which mature in the bowels of a decaying feudal system.

Bourgeois nationalism, as the ideology and policy of the bourgeoisie, emerges simultaneously with the bourgeois nations. European bourgeois nationalist concepts came in on the crest of anti-feudal revolutions, although at first they usually bore the specific imprint of popular democratic movements. As soon as the bourgeoisie becomes the ruling class, these conceptions begin to develop in accordance with the class nature of the different sections of the bourgeoisie. It should also be noted that bourgeois nationalist theories were closely bound up with the colonial policies and expansion of capitalism.

In appraising nationalism Marxism-Leninism invariably exercises a concrete historical approach. The nationalism of an oppressed nation is not to be identified with racialist and chauvinist nationalism, out to crush and exploit other nations, as the striving of oppressed peoples for independence played a prominent part in bringing about the collapse of the imperialist colonial system. From that standpoint this was a progressive movement, and was therefore vigorously supported by the working class of all countries, which is itself internationalist.

Proletarian internationalism, the world outlook and policy of the working class, was from a

historical, politico-economic and philosophical point of view a fundamentally new step forward in the development of consolidation.

The Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 was a heroic deed of international significance, performed by the workers and the poorest peasants of Russia. It breached the chain of world imperialism and ushered in a new era in the development of mankind, thus inaugurating a new civilisation. The October Revolution was a turning point in world history. It marked the beginning of the transition from capitalism to socialism which is the essential characteristic of our epoch.

The sixty years of the Soviet Union's existence have incontrovertibly shown that when the exploitation of man by man is abolished, all national strife, oppression and the enslavement of one nation by another will also disappear. The dialectics of the international and the national alters, and the life of society, with its changing relations between nations and nationalities, becomes subject to new, previously unknown, objective laws.

The national question is a major problem for any socialist revolution. In the Soviet Union it could not be solved without far-reaching social and economic reforms. Consistent implementation of Leninist national policy has helped to establish a permanent unification of all classes, nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union, a genuine brotherhood between peoples, which attests to the viability of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on internationalism.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Union, the General Secretary of the CC CPSU and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, observed: 'Communists have always viewed the national question through the prism of the class struggle, believing that its solution has to be subordinated to the interests of the Revolution, to the interests of socialism. That is why

Communists and all fighters for socialism believe that the main aspect of the national question is unification of the working people, regardless of their national origin, in the common struggle against every type of oppression, and for a new social system which rules out exploitation of the working people.'*

Concrete historical study of the Soviet Union's approach to the problems of national development at certain periods over the past decades reveals a range of objective laws first disclosed in the course of the revolution and the building of socialism. Following Lenin's ideas the Soviet Union has succeeded in bringing the backward peoples to the level of the more advanced. The broad mass of the people of all the country's nations and nationalities were drawn into building socialism—such has been the sum and substance of the national policy of the Soviet state throughout its history. Each of the fraternal peoples has enjoyed equal opportunity in social, economic and cultural socialist development, irrespective of economic and cultural level, size of population or territory, religion, etc.

Bourgeois and revisionist ideologists in the West allege that the significance of the Soviet experience holds good only for the USSR and is a special, if interesting, case. This merely overemphasises specific national factors at the expense of international factors, and thrusts aside all that has become the property of all the Soviet peoples and has served as a model for other peoples. Of course, every people will tackle the tasks before it in its own way, in the light of its own social and political circumstances—however that which has been accomplished in one-sixth of the globe will always remain a worthy object of profound study.

The entire socio-economic and political development of Soviet society—during the abolition of the exploiting classes, during the last world

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 55.

war and also during the building of developed socialism—has been of a consistently internationalist character. In the process of this development the unity and fraternal friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union were strongly manifested, and the patriotic and internationalist consciousness of the masses raised to a new level. Broad sections of working people of all nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union have developed an awareness of the Soviet people as a new historical community and consider themselves part of it. The emergence of this community is an essentially new stage in the universal historical process of consolidation, which is closely related to today's great social upheavals and scientific and technical revolution.

The progressive historical tendency towards the internationalisation of the economic and cultural life of society is realised in the operation of a whole range of new objective laws which govern the development of socialism as a world system. The international relations of fraternal cooperation and socialist mutual assistance constitute a new and higher type of international relations, which demonstrate that the essence of the socialist world system is an integral social formation which is not reducible to a simple totality of socialist states. The gradual drawing together of the socialist countries is today clearly seen as an objective law.

The socialist countries are inhabited by roughly a third of the world's population. Here social ownership of the means of production is predominant, while exploitation and national inequality do not exist. Internationalist views and morality are the property of all working people.

The socialist world system, the community of socialist states—an entirely new and unprecedented product of this epoch—makes a deep imprint on modern life as a whole. Leonid Brezhnev said: 'Development of the socialist countries, their greater might, and the greater

beneficial influence of their international policy—this is now the main direction in mankind's social progress.'* Developing and advancing, based on the activity of millions of free men and women, relying on ever greater socialist economic integration and the international socialist division of labour, the socialist countries are working tirelessly for further social progress, for lasting peace and international security. This is internationalism in action.

A great wave of national liberation revolutions destroyed the imperialist colonial system. The national liberation movements of our times substantially differ from those of the past. No longer local or isolated, these movements are a great international force. The intensity and the great scope of the anti-imperialist struggle waged by the peoples of the developing countries in support of their rights and against colonialism and neocolonialism are characteristic of this movement.**

Guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism, the USSR and other socialist countries give total support to the developing nations, while not seeking thereby to gain any benefits or concessions, military or economic, which is conducive to greater friendship and cooperation with the developing countries.

In the developing countries internationalisation manifests itself primarily in a vigorous united effort to oppose imperialism and its international

---

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU,* Moscow, 1976, p. 33.

** Many developing countries have been greatly hindered economically, and their situation further impaired by the ruthless exploitation, pillage and discrimination to which they are subjected as a part of the capitalist world market. During his trips in Asia and Africa the author often had the impression that he was travelling in a time machine: alongside mining and other modern enterprises one sees poor peasants and semi-proletarians engaged in the natural economy, and observes some primary forms of capitalist and even pre-capitalist economic relations, including usury and pre-capitalist forms of commodity exchange.

economic system. Simultaneously, intricate processes of social delimitation develop and there is stronger gravitation towards socialism as the only possible path to modern civilisation.

The modern capitalist world is in a profound crisis which extends to every aspect of life. In the struggle for social progress, freedom, democracy and socialism, the historic role of leader of the working people devolves on the working class. Associated with the most advanced forms of social production, the international working class is the chief exponent of the ideas of proletarian internationalism.

The Soviet Union and fraternal socialist countries undeviatingly adhere to the principles of internationalism in both their home and foreign policy. The key results of this policy in the international sphere are briefly: intensive multilateral development and improvement within the socialist community; a growth and consolidation of the ties between the USSR and the countries which have rid themselves of colonial dependence; a further strengthening of fraternal ties between the Soviet working class and the working class in other parts of the world; a development of more effective and active cooperation between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the fraternal parties of all countries.

A consistent and untiring struggle for a lasting, just and democratic world peace is one of the highest expressions of the internationalist character of Soviet foreign policy. Primarily thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Union and the socialist community, the menace of another world war has been averted, and international relations are moving from confrontation to cooperation. The most prominent changes are occurring in Europe, which has long been the scene and source of terrible, almost incessant wars. At the conclusion of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, held in Helsinki in 1975, a multilateral international legal document was issued, which

defined, for the first time in history, the principles and rules for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. This document has been signed by thirty-three European countries, and also by the USA and Canada.

The road to a new life is hard and perilous. But world socialism brightly illuminates this road for all peoples, though to see it clearly one must be well acquainted with the development of mankind from its beginnings to the present time.

The period of social antagonisms is but a very brief stage in the history of mankind. The intricate, rapidly changing pattern of events in the last quarter of the twentieth century, the accelerated pace of development of society, science and technology, indicate a rapid growth in the internationalisation of material and intellectual life, the limitless creative potential that is now developing in every nation and nationality on earth.

Chapter One

CONSOLIDATION PROCESSES IN WORLD HISTORY AND THEIR NATIONAL ASPECTS

> The *entire so-called history of the world* is nothing but the creation of man through human labour.
>
> *Karl Marx*

The peoples of the world have a long and eventful history. Modern science convincingly shows that the development of human society from the most ancient and primitive socio-economic forms to today's most consummate forms—socialism and communism—is a complex dialectical law-governed consolidative movement which proceeds in an ascending spiral. The turns of the spiral mark qualitative changes caused ultimately by labour, by the productive forces of society.

Labour is the primal and eternal condition of man's life. Engels stressed that 'history is *nothing but* the activity of man'.* Just as the unity of the world stems from its material nature, so the true unity of world history stems from labour, from social production.

For many hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of years, men not only worked communally, but also owned the means of production communally. Very slowly, and with a difficulty partly accounted for by abrupt changes in the environment, the productivity of labour increased and its implements were improved. The world's population gradually expanded, reaching about ten million by the start of the New Stone Age (the Neolithic).**

Simultaneously, the human communities grew in size

---

* Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, 'The Holy Family or Critique of Critical Criticism'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, Moscow, 1975, p. 93.

** At the beginning of the Christian era, the world's population amounted to 200-250 million. At the turn of the sixteenth century it was 400-500 million, and at the turn of the twentieth century 1,656 million. In 1974, according to UN figures, it was nearly 4,000 million and is

while diverse relations developed and became established between them. At that time classes did not yet exist, nor was there any exploitation of man by man.

In the Mesolithic period labour became more efficient. It gradually became a permanent source of the surplus product, that is, of the excess over subsistence requirements. Privileged members of the tribe began to appropriate the surplus product in one way or another, and a further division of labour among the tribes and tribal unions promoted the growth of labour productivity. A propertied and privileged elite appeared. Social relations changed and began to conflict with the customs of the primitive community. This became a source of the contention between the different social groups, from which the class struggle was later to spring. Private ownership of the means of production emerged and took root, and the few property owners began to exploit the majority of the people. Society was split into classes in the course of a long, fierce struggle. It then became necessary to have a force which would sustain the rule of one class over another so as to protect the exploiting system; the state arose as an instrument of the propertied classes to maintain their domination over the rest of the people. The class struggle became part of the history of all exploiting societies.

The establishment of exploitative relations worked a drastic change not only in the internal nature of historical human communities based on communal work and primitive democratic traditions, but also in the relations between these communities. The growth of production and the accompanying increase in the efficiency of labour caused the value of manpower to rise steadily. This intensified the desire of the ruling classes to capture more slaves, to subjugate other peoples and territories, and eventually to establish colonial regimes. Consolidation processes assumed antagonistic forms and acquired an essentially new character. Slave-owning society, feudalism, capitalism—these were steep and tragic stages in the

---

expected to reach 6,300 million in the year 2000 (See *Narodonaseleniye stran mira* [Population of the Countries of the World], Moscow, 1974, pp. 5-19).

development of society in that period of world history which the founders of Marxism called the pre-history of mankind. The abolition of antagonistic class societies put an end to the pre-history of mankind. With the emergence of socialism, the genuine history of mankind begins, free from exploitation and oppression, a history which increasingly reveals the tremendous potential of really free labour and knowledge.

The various consolidation processes characteristic of the antagonistic class systems mentioned above did not progress smoothly. The history of the despotic slave-owning empires and the more stable centralised feudal and bourgeois states is full of fierce class battles and wars. It is significant, however, that, despite savage oppression, which was justified in the name of law and religion, working people in all countries were willing to associate and cooperate. Be it communal labour—and the notions and morals appropriate to it—in village communities or craftsmen's associations, or the struggle of slaves, serfs and the poor townsfolk against the exploiters, the people's class solidarity and class struggle were at all times a major factor in social progress and consolidation, and were ultimately aimed against the oppressive rule of the exploiting classes.

In 1917 the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia ushered in a new epoch in the history of mankind. It abolished the exploitation of man by man and put an end to national and social oppression and inequality. In a relatively short time socialist social relations were firmly established in a quarter of the globe. In the building of a socialist society the processes of consolidation assumed a qualitatively different character.

The study of world history, and above all, of the history of the material bases of the life of society, where the modes of production and production relations regularly supersede one another, allows us to understand the immense social, political and intellectual changes in the life of peoples under different socio-economic systems, and also helps us to grasp the processes whereby different historical human communities, such as nationalities, nations and international communities, emerged and developed.

The specific historical circumstances of individual communities caused them to develop unevenly and affected their character, economic relations, territorial distribution, culture, domestic life, mentality and so on. To take no notice of these distinctive and comparatively stable conditions is counter to Marxism-Leninism, for national, ethnic, cultural and linguistic processes cannot be separated from socio-economic processes. They have always been but different aspects of one stream of existence. At the same time, material, economic, social, and class factors have always been and continue to be the basis of mankind's progress and development.

AT THE DAWN OF HUMAN SOCIETY

Contemporary science yields ample and growing evidence which explicitly confirms the cardinal Marxist-Leninist propositions on the role of labour in the emergence and development of human society. Science convincingly proves that before the emergence of antagonistic relations mankind had traversed a very long road from the most primitive hominids* to *homo habilis* ('handy man'), that is, to a stage at which man began regularly to use tools and implements, which at first were quite primitive and eventually became more sophisticated and varied. *Homo habilis* was evidently already at the last but one stage of development, at which he formed stable habits of making stone and bone implements and this, in turn, promoted his intellectual development.

Through a series of intermediate stages, primitive human hordes, while gradually changing the environment, were changing themselves too, changing physically, socially and morally, and acquiring some new features which were to become characteristic of the communities of modern man (*homo sapiens*—'intelligent man').

Homo habilis and *homo sapiens* represent different levels of the same enormous process which, having once started, went on continuously, if considered in global terms. All tribes and peoples on the earth, regardless of their

* Man's remote but closely related ancestors.

present cultural standards, reached the level of *homo sapiens* some 60,000-70,000 years ago. This is yet another weighty argument in favour of the political and socio-economic equality of all people and nations.

It is especially worth noting that the major shifts, which were fairly numerous on the road to *homo sapiens*, occurred in the most severe geological stages of the Riss and Würm glacials and the short Riss-Würm interglacial, when some branches of our precursors nearly died out. That man should have survived in such conditions, that such incredible hardships, instead of causing him to become extinct, rather stimulated his efforts by making him need new implements, clothing, means of transport, and so on, shows that at that time labour was already raising man to a higher level of development.

Hundreds and thousands of plant and animal species disappeared from the face of the earth, and new ones appeared, but mankind continued to increase, settling in the vacant zones and parts of the world, adapting the environment to its needs and approaching the dawn of the 'Neolithic revolution'. Only labour, the objects and implements which man made and had around him, and his communal efforts saved him from extinction in this critical epoch of early history.

Little is yet known about the period when human society was formed. Glaciers and earthquakes have destroyed much material evidence of man's remote past. The Riss glacial alone (only 200,000-130,000 years ago) wiped out many signs of the transition period. But, regardless of our insufficient knowledge, the available evidence shows that the Stone Age was a much longer period in the history of man than all the subsequent epochs put together. The millennia during which pre-class systems existed and the present era of socialism and communism make the claims that exploitation has always existed and that it is indispensable to human progress simply ridiculous.

Man's ancestry goes far back into the past. Human history began during the long and gradual separation of the hominids from the animal kingdom. The latest archaeological studies in South and East Africa, especially the finds made in the Olduvai Gorge (North Tanzania),

suggest that this separation occurred much earlier than was previously supposed, more than two million years ago (modern science places human history within the chronological limits of 1.8 to 2.5 million years).

From the earliest days of mankind laws distinguishing him from the animal kingdom began to operate. As he emerged, so did an entirely new milieu—the world of things produced by man and indispensable to his existence.

Tools, methods of making fire, dwellings, utensils, and the means of communication underwent constant improvement, while spiritual culture (language, customs, morals, rites, music and art) also developed within the framework of pre-class society. An artificial environment grew up around man, and a kind of barrier appeared, protecting him from the natural environment.

Today we know not only that the history of man is much longer than was previously supposed but also that man has descended from beings that walked erect and were social creatures. While still similar in many respects to his forerunners, primitive man acquired a fully erect attitude which left his hands free, and, as he fashioned objects from stone and bone, he became more and more skilful.* Of course, it took hundreds of millennia for these skills to be accumulated and retained, as skill is acquired mainly through training. But human labour requires, apart from training, mutual assistance, coordination and supervision. Therefore, labour is social by nature.

The social principle, the collective character of activity, is at the basis of all labour processes in which hominids engaged. The collective fabrication of tools and weapons which were then used on joint hunts, after which the spoils were divided, and the construction of common dwelling-places of a kind gave rise to the consolidation processes that determine the increasingly rapid progress of human history.

* Both plants and animals are subject to linear organic evolution. A cross between two different specific lines through hybridisation yields no viable progeny because of physiological incompatibility. One of the most important characteristics of species formation is that a species appears only once in history of the organic world. Owing to labour and the implements he made, *homo habilis* was excluded from the operation of this universal law.

During the long historical process of making and using implements, labour served to advance man in at least three respects simultaneously, by expanding his knowledge, enhancing his creative ability, and promoting his social development.

In all these respects, fire made an immense contribution. The ability to produce fire, to preserve and use it, was a powerful means of consolidating the social forms of life while reducing the separating influence of the physical environment. The exceptional social role played by fire derived from the fact that it was not owned either by individuals or groups. It was a major instrument without which the genesis of man, that crucial revolutionary transformation in nature and life, would have been aborted.

Modern man, *homo sapiens*, represents one biological species subdivided into races with different physical characteristics. Equatorial conditions, with the direct impact of burning sunlight, caused the dark pigmentation of man's skin (the Negroid race); cutting winds carrying sand and dust caused the slanting shape of the eyes and a more or less yellow pigmentation (the Mongoloid race); cold and inclement climate were conducive to a white skin pigmentation. There is a great diversity of intermediate forms.

These physical characteristics by no means indicate difference in intellect or racial inferiority, as was postulated by J. A. Gobineau, G. V. Lapouge, H. S. Chamberlain and the racists and psychoracists, who followed the Social Darwinists R. Benedict, Hutton and others. Contrary to these unscientific fabrications, mankind is a single entity, and has been so ever since its emergence. Moreover, this specific integrity develops through overcoming the contradictions which still persist in it. Class contradictions become aggravated, and there appear isolated ruling elites, exclusive groups which show great concern for the 'purity of blood'. But these artificially isolated privileged groups are swept away by the wind of social change in the transition from one formation to another. Whatever the conditions of class oppression and segregation, the lower exploited groups of society do not turn into new species marked by inferiority or anatomic

or physiological specialisation. No new species are formed, in spite of the immense distances by which people are separated, as they had already spread all over the globe in the pre-class stage.

Contemporary studies confirm the conclusion that the oldest human social form was the primitive horde, a rather unstable organisation, which emerged in the epoch of the primitive communal system. The first stable form of human social organisation was the matriarchal clan which was characterised by exogamy or prohibition of marriages between people belonging to the same kinship group. The great antiquity of this social pattern and its universal character have been proved by extensive archaeological and ethnographic evidence. According to the hypothesis currently enjoying most support, clans were at first joined by marriage. This pairing gradually became more stable, acquired some social functions and became the tribe, which usually comprised several clans with common organs of government.

The process of social consolidation (small social groups merging into large political and economic associations) proceeded far from painlessly. It involved the operation of military as well as economic and social factors. Military actions undertaken by the stronger tribes against their independent neighbours ended not infrequently in pillage or even extermination.

Nevertheless, had military operations taken precedence over peaceful activity, mankind would have perished long ago in internecine discord, which it did not. What is more, for all the twists and turns of fortune, the population of the earth continued to multiply, to settle all over the globe, and set up ever larger socio-political associations. The latter were very often established for the purpose of self-defence against aggression.

In the period that followed the last glaciation (the Holocene), the huntsmen and fishermen who settled along the tributaries and in the valleys of the Nile, Tigris, Euphrates, Indus and Hwang Ho, where nature was milder than in other places, began primitive irrigation and animal husbandry. This was a signal achievement of human society at the pre-class stage. Ancient civilisations also arose in the subtropical zone, on the basis of

irrigation agriculture and animal husbandry and using Neolithic and early metalworking techniques.

With the refinement of implements and the extension of economic activities, the modes of social structure grew more complex. The Soviet authors of the fundamental *History of the USSR* write: 'The emergence of varied population groups in the Neolithic was an event of immense historical significance. It marked the beginning of the formation of the ethnic groups that eventually formed the basis of nearly all European and Asian peoples of whom we learn later on from written sources. The agricultural and stockbreeding tribes of South-Eastern Europe and Central Asia evidently were the oldest Indo-Europeans, while North-Eastern Europe, the area east of the Ural Mountains and West Siberia were inhabited by the forerunners of the Ugro-Finnic tribes, and the vast steppes of East Siberia were the home of the pastoral tribes that later became the numerous Mongolian and Turkic peoples.'*

The transition from stone to metal, which started in the Paleolithic, the period between the Neolithic and Bronze ages, was an important stage in the history of ancient man. It was then that the production and processing of metal was added to mankind's great achievements in agriculture and stockbreeding. From then dates the disintegration of the primitive communal system. The matrilineal clan gradually developed into the gens (the patrilineal clan), which was replaced by the village community based on local, rather than kinship, relations. It was probably from then that wider and definitely differentiated ethno-social units began to replace kinship units. These processes intensified with the transition to the Bronze and Iron ages.

With the increase in production and exchange between tribal groups and the development of internecine wars and war democracy, relations between tribes grew closer, and tribal groupings and then unions were established. Tribal unions were responsible for the security of their members and maintained regular relations and exchange

---

* *Istoria SSSR* (History of the USSR), Part I, Vol. I, Moscow, 1976, p. 41.

between tribes. They differed from the tribal families not only by the social distinctions that had grown up in them and by economic inequality, but also by their ethnic structure. 'A union,' writes Yu. V. Bromley, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 'could comprise tribes from different families. In other words, a tribal union could be ethnically heterogeneous; in such cases it may reasonably be regarded as a kind of federation of several ethno-social communities.'*

Tribal unions undertook lengthy expeditions and migrations not only for military ends, but also with positive aims in view, for example, the development of vast territories, which required the joint effort of numerous communities. Such movements were also conducive to the mixing of populations, assimilation and dissimilation, and the alteration of ethnic and tribal boundaries. New, distinctive, cultural entities were taking shape.

The emergence of tribal unions and development of diverse relations in them made it necessary to develop a common language, as the principal means of communication. Tribal dialects were converging, and cultural and linguistic assimilation proceeding at a growing rate. These processes lie at the source of racial evolution, a long and many-sided process, involving the formation of a mobile and stable complex of characteristics common to a given ethno-social entity and making it distinct from other similar entities.

The latest scientific discoveries show that economic and social inequality had emerged in tribes and tribal unions before there was even the remotest sign of the appearance of national entities. This was the transition to a different, a class society.

AT THE ROOT OF CLASS ANTAGONISMS

Ever since society's division into classes, consolidation processes in the development of the human communities were characterised by mounting internal class differentia-

* Yu. V. Bromley, *Etnos i etnografia* (Ethnos and Ethnography), Moscow, 1973, p. 135.

tion, aggravation of antagonisms between the exploiters and the exploited, and the entrenchment of relations of domination and subordination. It is, therefore, not ethnic differentiation but solely the division of society into antagonistic classes that gave rise to violence, predatory wars, enforced colonisation, and the enslavement of the many by the few.

About 5,000 years ago, despotic slave-owning empires sprang up in some parts of the world. There the slave-owners 'not only owned all the means of production—the land and the implements, however, poor and primitive they may have been in those times—but also owned people'.* It should be borne in mind that ancient empires (e.g., the Assyrian-Babylonian and Persian empires) were neither ethnic formations nor the forerunners of more recent national units. The ethno-social units which existed at that time were usually intermingled several times (except, perhaps, in the practically inaccessible mountainous regions, where, owing to isolated conditions, there is still considerable ethnic variety).

On the fringe of the class societies in the second and first millennia B.C., there were unions of nomad tribes whose influence spread over the vast area from the Danube and the Caspian Sea to the Pacific Ocean. The nomad peoples (e.g., the Arabs) widely practised the adaptation of strangers and entire ethnic tribal units.

A similar process developed among settled tribes, for example, the Slavs, who in the middle of the first millennium A.D., were compelled to form more stable defensive tribal unions in order to protect themselves from the invasions of the nomads living in the south. There were also 'alliances of tribal unions', 'protonationalities', and so on.

Soviet scientists have made many fundamental and original contributions to the study of human communities in their early stages. Simultaneous research in archaeology, ethnography, the history of language and writing, and so on, have made it possible to comprehend more

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'The State', *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, Moscow, 1974, p. 475.

thoroughly the social, popular character of material and cultural development in that period.

At a certain stage of history, when the growth of production had rendered economic, political, cultural and other relations more lasting and stable, there began to emerge new and larger communities or nationalities, as Engels called them with reference to European history. Many ethno-social entities that had existed under the slave-owning system or early in the feudal period merged into these new communities, which subsequently developed into nations, although this certainly did not happen in every case. For example, the Krivichi, Polochane, Radimichi, Vyatichi, Dregovichi, Ulichi, Severyane, Drevlyane, Volhyniane, Polyane and other East Slav tribes were not 'nationalities'. They came together to form the Old Russian nationality in the ninth century.

There is abundant historical evidence that nationalities often merged. This led to the later appearance of larger nationalities, which developed into nations or national states. In this case, kinship played a less important role than before; all the larger nationalities and nations were polyethnic in origin, as they had formed from different older communities. An enormous role was played by the development of production and exchange, the class struggle, defence against incursions, and so on.

To quote an example, in the ancient Old Russian state, assartage (i.e., preparing an area for farming by cutting down the trees and undergrowth and burning them) was replaced by three-course rotation as early as the ninth century; iron and steel were widely used for making implements and weapons; numerous towns sprang up as centres of handicraft production and exchange; and crafts such as iron working, smithery, pottery, and gold-work emerged, the latter two being very widespread. The Slavonic system of writing appeared at this time, and international relations grew. This, to some extent, extended to the villages too, but economic isolation was still predominant. Lenin wrote in this connection that the 'pre-capitalist countryside constituted (from the economic point of view) *a network of small local markets which linked up tiny groups of small producers, severed from each other by their*

separate farms, by the innumerable medieval barriers between them'.*

In the course of time, the feudal system underwent extensive change, leading ultimately to the emergence of more stable communities. The latter provided the basis of a centralised Russian state.

Speaking of Russian history, Lenin stressed, for example, that 'by the Middle Ages, the era of the Moscovite tsars, ... kinship ties no longer existed, that is to say, the state was based on associations that were local: the landlords and the monasteries acquired peasants from various localities, and the communities thus formed were purely territorial associations. But one could hardly speak of national ties in the true sense of the term at that time: the state split into separate "lands", sometimes even principalities, which preserved strong traces of the former autonomy, peculiarities of administration, at times their own troops (the local boyars went to war at the head of their own companies), their own tariff frontiers, and so forth. Only the modern period of Russian history (approximately from the seventeenth century) is characterised by the actual amalgamation of all such regions, lands and principalities into one whole ... it was brought about by the increasing exchange among regions, the gradually growing circulation of commodities, and the concentration of the small local markets into a single, all-Russia market.'**

This was the period of late feudalism in Russia, that is, a time when there, as in many other countries, primary capitalist economic forms began to emerge and the future capitalist nations began to mature in the bowels of the feudal states. Different peoples went through these processes at different times and in different ways.

The clan-tribe-nationality-nation schema, adopted earlier by some researchers to describe the development of historical communities is simplicistic; the reality was much more complex. This schema often consigns to the same

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Development of Capitalism in Russia', *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1972, p. 381.

** V. I. Lenin, 'What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats', *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1974, pp. 154-155.

category historical communities of very dissimilar types, which sharply differed in the levels of their social and economic development, degree of ethnic consolidation, and so on. Simply delimiting communities according to pre-capitalist formations (e.g., 'a slave-owning nationality', 'a feudal nationality') will not do either, since consolidation processes in these formations developed differently in different areas, very often being highly complex and contradictory. Sometimes there was no essential difference between relations in the slave-owning and early feudal societies.

It is absolutely unscientific and unsound to try to 'bring under one roof' communities as fundamentally different in their socio-economic structure, class composition, predominant culture and ideology, way of life and morality as the capitalist and the socialist nations.

The facts show that, in the hands of the bourgeoisie, national policy served, and continues to serve, to divide, isolate, aggrieve and antagonise nations, and to oppress and enslave most of them, whereas social and national policies in the hands of the working class serve to ensure the international consolidation of the working people of all nations and nationalities, to abolish their inequality, and to achieve higher material and cultural standards for all on the basis of socialism and developed socialism.

Considering the accumulated historical experience and the latest scientific evidence, one would suggest, with a view to promoting a broader and more correct understanding of the historical processes, the following generalised schema of community development: the primitive horde; clan and tribe*; tribal union; more developed socio-ethnic units of slave-owning or early feudal societies (including federations of tribal unions, protonationalities); nationalities; capitalist nations; socialist nations; international socialist communities.

This schema, like any other, is to some extent conventional. Each major period may be further divided into several subperiods or intermediate forms; the specific

* Academician B. A. Rybakov, a prominent Soviet historian, considers it correct to regard the clan and the tribe as one stage, always on the understanding that they are two qualitatively different, though related, elements.

paths of development of different communities also vary.* By and large this development was not rectilinear but advanced gradually from lower to higher and more complex forms, sometimes skipping intermediate links.

This schema embraces major historical stages in the development of human communities. Almost every one of the categories referred to is polysemantic, having a different content in different historical periods. For example, the word *tribe*, referring in this schema mostly to very ancient times, is often also used with reference to the periods of disintegration of the clan and the tribe, and even with reference to the feudal and capitalist epochs, though it carries a different meaning in such cases.

The concept *national* is highly polysemantic. It embraces both nationalities and nations, and under mature socialism it also covers various national aspects. The polysemy of the concept 'national' makes it possible to view a fairly wide range of problems in the historical context. One should, however, bear in mind the diversity, conventionality and mobility of this concept.

History does not of course flow smoothly. Consolidation processes differed from people to people. But in the chain of events in world history, the interaction and mutual influence of peoples is clearly apparent. If at particular points in time certain peoples or countries push forward in their development, their culture is not absorbed passively by other nationalities and countries, but is perceived in the light of the latter's own experience. The influence is mutual, so that the peoples which have been subjected to some outside cultural influence subsequently exert a beneficial influence on their 'teachers'. Every people contributes in one way or another to the common store, and progress is promoted by the common effort of all peoples.

---

* Consolidation processes in world history clearly cannot be reduced to socio-ethnic or national processes. The forms of consolidation are also very important; for example, the formation of large multinational or national states, and the development of regional relations, as in medieval Europe where Latin played a significant part in cultural consolidation.

NATIONAL CONSOLIDATION PROCESSES IN WESTERN EUROPE

Let us now turn to the emergence and development of nationalities and nations. The formation of national states in the period of feudalism was examined by Marx and Engels, whose works on the subject are models of scientific analysis. In his works on the history of the peasant war in Germany in 1525, and in his manuscripts devoted to the formation and development of nationalities and nations in Europe and the emergence of national states, Engels gives particular prominence to the role played by the masses and the class struggle in the formation of nations.

Engels emphasises that up to the ninth century there were fairly marked distinctions between the national communities in Western Europe, where, after the fall of the Roman Empire, 'out of the early medieval tangle of peoples, there gradually developed new nationalities, a process by which, as is known, in most of the former Roman provinces, the conquered—the peasants and townspeople—assimilated the conqueror, the Germanic lord. The modern nationalities thus equally arise from the oppressed classes.'*

One specific manifestation of this process was the division into linguistic groups. There are, for example, texts, in Old High German and Old French, of the oaths of alliance between Louis the German, King of the East Franks, and Charles the Bald, Holy Roman Emperor and King of the West Franks, concluded in 842.

'Once language groups were delimited,' Engels wrote, '...it was natural that they served as a definite groundwork for the formation of states, that the nationalities began to develop into nations. How strong this element was even in the ninth century is clear from the rapid disintegration of the composite state of Lotharingia. Granted, throughout the Middle Ages, language boundaries and geopolitical boundaries far from coincided; still, every nationality, except perhaps Italy, was represented in Europe by a

* Marx/Engels, 'Über den Verfall des Feudalismus und das Aufkommen der Bourgeoisie', *Werke*, Bd. 21, Berlin, 1962, S. 395.

separate large state, and the tendency towards establishing national states, which manifested itself ever more clearly and consciously, constituted one of the most important levers of progress in the Middle Ages.'*

Let us trace the essential points in the process of national consolidation in France. As noted by contemporary Marxist historians, in the ninth and tenth centuries in France, feudal relations of production gave a powerful impetus to the development of productive forces based on the coexistence of large-scale landed property and small farming. In the tenth to the thirteenth centuries, the available arable land greatly increased as large forest areas were cleared and marshes and waste land brought under cultivation. This was possible thanks solely to the extensive use of iron and steel in the production of agricultural implements. The social division of labour between industry and agriculture also extended and strengthened internal economic relations. Production became more developed than it had been under the slave-owning system and early feudalism, and the natural economy disintegrated slowly but surely. Owing to the growth of production and the further division and cooperation of labour, there developed commodity-monetary relations and increasing importance attached to the towns with their guilds or associations. The development of the towns, of craft industry and trade provided the material groundwork for more stable national ethnic relations, facilitating the emergence of a territorial unity characteristic of the future French nation.

Enormous influence on the entire history of the French people was exerted by the anti-feudal movements which went on almost incessantly throughout the whole period of feudalism. Initially resistance developed for the most part within the boundaries of different seigniories, but later also occurred on a larger scale. In 997, a peasant rising broke out in Normandy, where the peasants had been deprived of the free use of the forests and waters. Brittany was the scene of another rising at the turn of the eleventh century.

G. and C. Willard, French historians, write: 'In the

---

* *Ibid.*, S. 396.

tenth century, the immense mass of the peasants, dispossessed by the seigneurs, became serfs. Hence the precocious and acute character of the class struggle which started very early and embraced, although in rudimentary form, the entire peasantry. This helps to explain the force of revolutionary traditions that make up an essential trait of the French national character.'*

Later widespread peasant movements, such as the shepherds' rising of 1321, the great Jacquerie (the peasant revolt of 1358) and other movements, led first to the restriction of the arbitrary rule of seigneurs and the regulation of feudal services and dues, and then to the gradual abolition of serfdom, which was one of the prerequisites of the establishment, at a much later date, of the capitalist mode of production in the country.

Jean Bruhat, a progressive French historian, writes: 'Risings prompted by misery, despair and hunger, savagely suppressed, were nevertheless, not in vain. They contributed to the disappearance of serfdom. Starting from the thirteenth century, millions of serfs were affranchised. This was no sentimental step on the part of the seigneurs, due to pity, but was rather done from fear as well as out of consideration for new interests. They wanted only to avoid those uprisings which, like slave revolts, could shake the whole structure of the feudal world.'**

As the separation of industry from farming became greater, the urban population increased and more villages developed into towns. Simultaneously, the number of artisans grew. The urban elite was faced by a mass of artisans and small traders groaning under the burden of taxation. Social contradictions in the towns became more acute. The struggle of artisans and the emerging proto-proletariat in the towns became increasingly associated, and often identified, with the peasant revolts. In 1356-1358, there was an uprising of Parisian artisans, known as the Etienne Marcel insurrection. The end of the fourteenth century was marked by a series of similar spontaneous

* Germanie and Claude Willard, *Formation de la nation française (du X^e siècle au début du XIX^e siècle)*, Editions sociales, Paris, 1955, p. 15.

** Jean Bruhat, *Histoire du movement ouvrier français*, t. 1, Editions sociales, Paris, 1952, pp. 46-47.

risings of the urban poor, when, as Marx wrote, *the lower classes of the people took up arms, killed or drove out the tax collectors, and meted out rough justice to the rich.**

The national consolidation of the French people was also advanced by wars of liberation. In the Middle Ages, the French waged a long struggle, including the so-called Hundred Years War (1337-1453), against the English invaders. The struggle for independence enhanced patriotic self-awareness among the French, causing them to rally together and advancing from their ranks many heroes, one of whom was the legendary Joan of Arc.

French national culture—language, literature, folklore, the arts, education—also gradually formed and developed. There was a distinction, which in the Middle Ages often appeared in the garb of religious heresy, between the democratic cultural tendency, connected in one way or another with the people's labour and aspirations (folklore, the folk theatre, literature, etc.), and the upper-class aristocratic trend—representing the nobility and the clergy—whose best exponents also drew on folk art.

As early as the fourteenth century in France a partial coincidence could be seen between the interests of the peasants and the townspeople in their opposition to the feudal lords and assertions of the peasants' right to land. This led to the collapse of the feudal system at the end of the eighteenth century.

As mentioned above, serfdom in France fell in the Middle Ages under the blows of peasant risings. The peasants successfully defended their right to own land (seisin). Nevertheless, with the growth of commodity-monetary relations, the exploitation of the peasants increased and many of them were ruined. According to an English traveller who visited France in the 1460s, 'French peasants drank water, ate apples and very dark rye bread. They had no meat but only a very little lard now and then, or the guts and heads of the animals they killed for the table of the local nobles and merchants. Their clothes did not protect them from the cold....

---

* *The Archives of Marx and Engels*, Vol. VI, Moscow, 1939, p. 65 (in Russian).

Altogether, these inhabitants of the most fertile kingdom in the world lived in extreme poverty.'* The landlords took hardly any part in the economic life of the village. They lived in the cities, seeking the patronage of the royal court and living on the pensions the king granted them in addition to their rents.

All these factors, and especially the intensifying class struggle, seriously influenced the consolidation processes. The centralisation of government increased, the army grew in importance, and the extreme disunity which was the hallmark of early Middle Ages in France gradually disappeared. The first large feudal states sprang up—the Duchy of Normandy, the County of Champagne, and the Royal Domain of Ile-de-France.

All these changes, although notable, did not alter the general socio-economic picture of feudal society. At the same time, they were great enough to cause the emergence of a national state in which production and consumption were no longer confined within the limits of individual principalities or counties.

The emergence of the centralised state exerted an accelerating effect on the formation of nations. Engels wrote: 'Spain, France and England, at the end of the fifteenth century became cemented into fully formed national states. This consolidation was epoch-making for the fifteenth century.'** The absolute monarchies in Western Europe were definite socio-economic entities of a feudal type. They provided the machinery of government, designed to protect the interests of the feudal lords collectively, as a class.

The emergence of national states in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a major historical turning point which marked the beginning of the development of nations in the bowels of late feudalism. This process, which took two or three centuries, was marked by two contradictory tendencies. On the one hand, it was a period of broad and diverse anti-feudal movements, which sometimes assumed a religious com-

---

* G. and C. Willard, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

** Friedrich Engels, 'Varia über Deutschland'. In: Marx/ Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 18, Berlin, 1969, S. 589.

plexion (e.g., the Reformation) and which eventually rose to the level of straightforward anti-feudal revolutions. This was revealed most dramatically and on the largest scale in France, but was observable in other countries as well. On the other hand, at the same period the primary forms of the capitalist relations of production gradually matured: primary accumulation of capital, the development of manufactory and the exchange of commodities, the beginnings of colonisation, and so on.

As time passed, the absolutist centralised state in France, which was the embodiment of feudal domination, changed from a factor contributing to social progress into a fetter on that progress and was increasingly challenged by the forces of growing anti-feudal revolution.

In the middle of the eighteenth century in France there appeared a brilliant galaxy of enlighteners, philosophers and scientists. The ideologists of the French Enlightenment, Diderot, Helvetius, Holbach and others, criticised the feudal regime, tyranny and slavery, religious ideology and the church. They upheld materialism and atheism, and advocated equality and the need for a drastic reorganisation of society on just and democratic principles. Some of the ideological forerunners of the bourgeois revolution—Montesquieu, Voltaire and others—entertained more moderate views. While the slogan 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' occupied a central place in the works of the French Enlighteners, bourgeois ownership and the system of capitalist exploitation were regarded as the permanent foundations of society.

Mably, Morelly, and Meslier produced a much more incisive criticism of the entire system of private ownership. They came out in favour of a revolutionary transformation of the social system, so that all goods and resources should belong to everyone and be enjoyed in common.

Jean Jacques Rousseau occupies a prominent place among the precursors of the bourgeois revolution. He sharply criticised the feudal estates and the despotic regime, advocating bourgeois democracy and civil liberties and speaking for the equality of men. He saw private ownership as the root of social inequality. The ideas of equality, which indirectly reflected the peasants' striving to shake off the fetters of feudal oppression, the ideas of

democracy, and the generally revolutionary spirit of his writings made him a great forerunner of the revolution. Robespierre, Marat, Saint-Just and their Jacobin Club associates were fervent admirers of Rousseau and Rousseauism.

These different ideological trends, which reflected the interests of the different social groups and classes, did not agree on very basic questions though they were all directed against feudalism. On the whole, however, society was dominated by the idea of the unity of the third estate.

Feudalism in France was unanimously opposed by the third estate, the unprivileged tax-paying class of peasants and such town dwellers as merchants, artisans, the urban bourgeoisie, and other commoners. The nobles and the clergy (especially the higher clergy) did not pay taxes at all. The third estate, of course, was rent in its turn by class contradictions and an acute, if latent, struggle. But the French bourgeoisie was pushing ahead, and, because it needed popular support against the aristocracy, it readily included itself in the allegedly united third estate, opposed to the aristocracy and the clergy.

Towards the end of the 1780s, the popular movements—uprisings of the peasants and the poverty-stricken city populace—assumed an increasingly formidable character. They were growing into a nationwide movement of irresistible strength.

The great French Revolution started on 14 July 1789, when the people of Paris took the Bastille by storm. Popular uprisings against the absolute monarchy swept the country. The new government was headed by the bourgeois party of constitutionalists—the Feuillants—who represented the third estate. With the rapid growth of the popular revolution, however, this party soon became a conservative and then a counter-revolutionary force. The darlings of the constitutionalist bourgeoisie, including Mirabeau and Lafayette, eager to 'halt the revolution', made a deal with the royal court, going over to the camp of reaction.

On 10 August 1790, this counter-revolutionary government was swept away by a popular uprising. The new government was headed by the Girondists, who rep-

resented the 'radical' provincial bourgeoisie (largely merchants, manufacturers and some bourgeois landowners). These men had an interest in securing their revolutionary gains. But in spite of this shift to the 'left', the main issues of the revolution—the agrarian question, universal suffrage, protection of the interests of the urban poor, defence against the threat of foreign invasion—remained unresolved. On achieving power, the Girondists also came to see their principal task in hindering the revolution or putting a stop to it altogether.

Between 31 May and 2 June 1793, the insurgent people overthrew the Girondists and put government into the hands of the Jacobins. The popular revolution reached its climax. In those days, the revolutionary people of France, led by the Jacobins, demonstrated its true greatness and strength. It took the Jacobin National Convention six weeks to accomplish what the leaders of the bourgeois revolution had failed to do in the previous four years. The land of the counter-revolutionary emigres was turned over to the peasants, who also got back all the common land that the landowners had seized from them. All feudal services were abolished and arrears cancelled completely and without compensation. The first democratic constitution in French history was adopted.

Nevertheless, the bourgeoisie and the bulk of the well-to-do peasants began to oppose the Jacobin dictatorship. The Ventôse decrees (1794) on sharing the property of the enemies of the revolution among the poor and on fixing the prices of food and manufactured goods were highly resented by broad sections of the bourgeoisie. They were never put into effect because of silent resistance and surreptitious sabotage by government officials, both in the capital and provinces.

The Jacobin dictatorship crushed feudalism, saved the country from foreign invaders, and ensured national unity. Yet, at that time neither Jacobin concepts nor the slogan of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity could transcend the limits of bourgeois society. The force capable of carrying the revolution through to final victory, to the triumph of genuine democracy, did not yet exist.

Yet we must not consider the slogan 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' to be purely bourgeois, for at that time it also

expressed the striving of the people, above all, of the common peasants and townspeople, for emancipation.

Should Diderot, Rousseau, Robespierre, Marat and other great forerunners and leaders of the popular revolution in France be unreservedly placed in the category of representatives of the bourgeoisie? A scrutiny of Robespierre's activity shows that there is no reason to say that he defended the interests of the bourgeois elite. On the contrary, he waged a struggle against them, with the people's support and for their sake. He was revolutionary democracy personified. Belinsky, Herzen and other great Russian democrats thought very highly of his profound democratism, his implicit faith in the people, his indomitable courage and revolutionary determination.

In appraising the national and revolutionary movements of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, one cannot fail to see the immense and, indeed, decisive role of the masses, especially the peasants and the common townsfolk, in those movements. The same is true of the French Revolution. In Lenin's words, 'it left its imprint on the entire nineteenth century, the century which gave civilisation and culture to the whole of mankind'.* Lenin repeatedly said that the greatness of the French Revolution of 1789-1794 consisted, above all, in the fact that while it was bourgeois by character, the forces that gave rise to it were popular.** Nevertheless, even in France the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution were not solved either consistently or finally.

Lenin wrote: 'A hundred and fifty and two hundred and fifty years ago the progressive leaders of that revolution (or of those revolutions, if we consider each national variety of the one general type) promised to rid mankind of medieval privileges, of sex inequality, of state privileges for one religion or another (or "religious *ideas*", "the church" in general), and of national inequality. They promised, but did not keep their promises. They could

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education', *op. cit.*, Vol. 29, Moscow, 1974, p. 371.

** V. I. Lenin, 'The Achievements and Difficulties of the Soviet Government', *op. cit.*, p. 67.

not keep them, for they were hindered by their "respect"—for the "sacred right of private property".'*

The progress and outcome of the revolution showed that the bourgeoisie cannot lead a really popular democratic revolution, translating into practice the hopes and aspirations of the working people. The working class alone can be the genuine leader of a popular revolution, but at that time it was only just emerging on the world stage.

The formation of the English nation was marked by unique and distinctive features, which were due, above all, to the specific character of the feudal system in England, where free village communities had long existed. Early in the ninth century several Anglo-Saxon kingdoms unified into a single state in England. The conquest of England by the Normans in the latter half of the eleventh century was a major prerequisite of national consolidation, aiding the development of political centralisation. It furthered the final establishment of feudalism, thus bringing about a general worsening of the peasants' situation and exposing them to even greater exploitation. Simultaneously, England's relations with the continent extended, its domestic and foreign trade increased, and the cities grew rapidly. The Norman conquest also resulted in the emergence of two distinct ethnic entities embodied respectively in the powerful and united Norman aristocracy who spoke French, and the politically impotent and fragmented Anglo-Saxon masses. Towards the close of the twelfth century, the ethnic and linguistic distinctions between the conquerors and the native population were much less pronounced. The London dialect, notably influenced by French and Latin, became supreme. In the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, the language and territorial unity of the entire population was definitely established. There emerged a national market centred on London.

The political evolution of feudal England from the middle of the twelfth century to the beginning of the fourteenth consisted principally in the centralisation of government, which was dictated by the country's social

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution', *op. cit.*, Vol. 33, Moscow, 1973, pp. 53-54.

and economic development. Centralisation proceeded in England more easily and rapidly than in other European countries. Analysing the specific features of the formation of the English nation, Engels wrote that England became consolidated through the Wars of the Roses, which destroyed the higher nobility, but only after it had had to give up its Quixotic plans of conquest in France—similar to the Germans' Roman campaigns—which would have bled it white, just as had happened in Germany.*

As early as the Middle Ages England was maintaining extensive trade relations with continental Europe, exporting large amounts of wool and woollen goods. In the sixteenth century England began to develop the woollen, cotton and silk industries, and metalworking and mining manufactories (mainly of the scattered 'domestic system'). The increasing demand for wool and the growth of commodity-monetary relations resulted in enclosures of common lands and large-scale dispossession of peasants who had their plots taken away from them and their houses and whole villages destroyed. Peasants, artisans and other displaced and impoverished people began to rebel against increasing exploitation and higher taxes (e.g., the Robert Ket rebellion in 1549). This struggle culminated in the English bourgeois revolution of the seventeenth century.

The Tudor dynasty (1485-1603) dealt with the paupers by introducing extremely harsh vagrancy laws against the expropriated, in which vagabonds and beggars were seen as criminals and subjected to cruel penalties.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England saw the strengthening of a monarchy which protected the interests of the new gentry enriched by the enclosures, and also looked after the interests of an emerging bourgeoisie which was growing in political and economic strength. Simultaneously, there was rapid differentiation in terms of property and class among the artisans, the vast majority of whom were also ruined, becoming paupers or wage labourers.

The English bourgeois revolution of 1649 set off the

---

* Friedrich Engels, 'Varia über Deutschland'. In: Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 18, S. 589.

process whereby capitalism established itself in Europe. The revolution crushed the resistance of the old feudal nobility, the church, and the absolute monarchy. Its gains were only moderately democratic, however, and benefited the new gentry and the prosperous bourgeoisie. The popular movement to carry the revolution further, to find, among other things, a democratic solution to the agrarian question, was sternly suppressed.

It is significant that in the English revolution too there was a revolutionary democratic wing known as the Diggers, which expressed the interests of the poor peasants and townspeople and especially of those peasants with little or no land, who had been ruined by the enclosures and were subjected to both feudal and capitalist exploitation. The Diggers' leader, Winstanley, promulgated the idea of a 'Free Republic', in which there would be no exploitation of man by man, and advanced the ideal of common ownership and collective labour. Their agrarian programme implied total abolition of feudal landownership and, ultimately, the abolition of private landownership.

With the triumph of the English bourgeois revolution of the seventeenth century, which secured the preeminence of the capitalist mode of production, the formation of the English nation was essentially completed.

The German nation formed in a markedly different way from France and England. The creation of a German national state was hampered by the Holy Roman Empire, which arose in 964, on the basis of German and some French and Slav territories. It considered Italy as its own domain, and regarded Rome as its centre. In view of this, Germany at that time, as Engels wrote, was 'no *national* complex'.* Within the framework of the early feudal state in Germany, the German tribes were merely unified politically and only the foundations of the German nationality were laid.

In the Middle Ages, the Holy Roman Empire gradually disintegrated. The growing might of the feudal lords, who strove for unlimited autocracy in 'their own' tribes and principalities and sought to enslave Slav and Italian areas, made the formation of a centralised state difficult. As

* Marx/Engels, *loc. cit.*

Engels pointed out, claims to world domination, the squandering of strength in campaigns of conquest (for example, in Italy), and the sale of landsknechts created additional obstacles to national consolidation.

The economic ties between different parts of the country were weak, and this prevented the creation of a common home market. Nor was there a common economic centre such as Paris or London. Extreme political disunity retarded economic progress and aggravated social antagonisms.

Simultaneously, the growth of the cities and the extension of world economic relations and internal commodity-monetary relations were accompanied by a sharpening of class contradictions in Germany. The class struggle reached its height in the Peasant War of 1524-1525, which was of great importance to the destiny of the German nation. The war developed into a great mass movement which spread over the larger part of German territory, threatening to shake the very foundations of the feudal system. It was a heroic epoch in German history. 'The German people, too, have their revolutionary tradition,' wrote Engels. 'There was a time when Germany produced characters that could match the best men in the revolutions of other countries, when the German people displayed an endurance and vigour which would in a more centralised nation have yielded the most magnificent results....'*

Engels called the Peasant War of 1525 a cornerstone of German history. Using concrete material, he traced the entire course of the war in detail, and showed how at that period the historical scene was dominated by the revolutionary peasants and the poor townsfolk who took up arms against feudal oppression, although still using a religious pretext. Engels considered an understanding of this period essential to the comprehension of similar processes in other countries and under other historical circumstances. Summarising the course of centuries, he called attention to the complex and contradictory processes that occurred during that transitional period and also

---

* F. Engels, 'The Peasant War in Germany'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 10, Moscow, 1978, p. 399.

pointed out their potential value to the liberation movements of more recent times. In *The Peasant War in Germany* and other works Engels arrived at the following conclusions:

(a) the German peasantry was at that time as national as the gentry or burghers, unlike the feudal lords and overlords and the reactionary clergy, who strove to maintain feudal disunity within the boundaries of the Holy Roman Empire, in other words, acted against the national interest of Germany;

(b) given a concrete distribution of the class forces, the peasantry was, objectively and subjectively, the main driving force of the revolution and of the movement for national unification;

(c) in that epoch, a peasant victory could ultimately do nothing but help the establishment of the capitalist system—albeit the capitalist system in its most democratic, progressive, anti-feudal, national form;

(d) the Peasants' War could not succeed because of the fragmented state of the peasantry, because the burghers betrayed the national interest by compromising with the princes, and because of the weakness of the lesser gentry, who at first had sided with the peasants;

(e) the failure of the Peasants' War retarded the further development of the German nation, expunging its name for three centuries from the list of politically active European nations;

(f) had there been in the country a real political force capable of bringing the fragmented mass of the peasants together under revolutionary democratic banners or had the insurgent peasants been able to link up with the liberation movements in other countries, the peasantry could have been victorious. There was, however, no such force that time either in Germany or in any neighbour countries;

(g) some three hundred years later, during the 1848-1849 revolution, a new force, the proletariat, appeared in the arena of political struggle, showing that it alone could successfully lead a revolutionary movement of the working people. The German bourgeoisie, however, frightened by the proletarian and peasant unrest, again contracted a counter-revolutionary compromise with the feudal aristoc-

racy and Junkers, thereby betraying, just as in 1525, the cause of German national unification on democratic principles;

(h) the lessons of the 1848-1849 revolution enriched the theory, strategy and tactics of the revolutionary proletariat, showing that the alliance of workers and working peasantry under working-class leadership was necessary to ensure the triumph of a democratic revolution, to overcome the exploiters, and build a socialist society.*

The above conclusion not only applies to Germany as it was at that time, but also has universal significance. Marx, Engels and Lenin stressed that, by reason of its own class and international interests, the proletariat aims for a revolution supported 'by some second edition of the Peasant War',** by national liberation movements, enabling the working peasantry and oppressed peoples to proceed, with the help of the countries where the working class has already been victorious, towards socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage.

Analysing the Peasant War in Germany, Engels paid particular attention to the ideological and political programme of one of its leaders, Thomas Münzer. According to Engels, this programme 'was less a compilation of the demands of the plebeians of that day than a brilliant anticipation of the conditions for the emancipation of the proletarian element that had scarcely begun to develop among the plebeians—this programme demanded the immediate establishment of the kingdom of God on Earth.... By the kingdom of God Münzer meant a society with no class differences, no private property and no state authority independent of, and foreign to, the members of society. All the existing authorities, insofar as they refused to submit and join the revolution, were to be overthrown, all work and all property shared in common, and complete equality introduced. A union was to be established to realise all this, and not only throughout Germany, but throughout Christendom. Princes and lords would be invited to join, but should they refuse the union

---

* *Ibid*, pp. 399-482.

** 'Engels to Marx in London, Manchester, May 23, 1836'. In: Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1975, p. 86.

was to take up arms and overthrow or kill them at the first opportunity.'*

As is known, not only did Germany fail to achieve national unity in the sixteenth century, but it also failed to achieve it much later, in the 1848-1849 revolution. It was only in 1871 that Bismarck, the spokesman of the Prussian Junkers, in an alliance with the higher German bourgeoisie, unified Germany 'by blood and iron'. Austria was ejected from the union of German states, and in consequence an independent Austrian nation was formed.

CONSOLIDATION AMONG THE SLAVS

Let us see how Slav nationalities and nations were formed. The Slavs are the most numerous group of peoples in Europe, united by their common origin and the similarity of their languages and history.

The ancient Russian state emerged early in the feudal epoch in the ninth to the twelfth centuries. It was the largest and one of the most advanced among contemporary European states. Its emergence was preceded by a long process of development towards socio-ethnic unity. 'Rus, as a people possessed of definite ethnic features, with domestic and economic habits,' wrote Academician B. D. Grekov, an eminent Soviet historian, 'did not suddenly appear on the historical scene. The people, with its own language, working habits, customs and morals, formed as the result of a long and continuous ethnogenic and historical process.... At this time, the first which our sources describe, the Russians are already in possession of a culture of their own, undoubtedly linked genetically with their distant past.'**

Even before the emergence of the ancient Russian state, the peoples subsequently united in it had been well familiar with agriculture, the wooden plough, draught animals, three-course rotation and animal husbandry. Handicrafts had already separated from agriculture. There were cities such as Kiev, Novgorod, Smolensk,

---

* Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 10, p. 422.

** B. D. Grekov, *Kievskaya Rus* (Kiev Rus), Moscow, 1953, p. 3.

Chernigov, Polotsk, which were seats of industry, commerce, and administration. It was a society in which only vestiges of clan and tribal relations remained, while communities based on contiguity and purely territorial political division were predominant. The ancient Russians struck root on a vast territory which they considered theirs by habit and custom.

In the tenth and eleventh centuries, there already existed on the vast territory of ancient Russia a uniform culture, common economic relations, such as were possible under the feudal economic system, and a common language with its dialects. 'The history of the ancient Russian state,' B. D. Grekov points out, 'is not the history of the Ukraine or of Byelorussia or of Great Russia. It is the history of a state which made it possible for the Ukraine, for Byelorussia, and for Great Russia to take shape and grow. In this relation lies the whole immense significance of this period in the life of our country'*.

F. P. Filin, an eminent Soviet student of the Slavonic languages, writes: 'Russian, Ukrainian and Byelorussian are sister languages descended from one ancestor, the Old Russian (East Slavonic) language. Old Russian formed in the seventh and eighth centuries from the numerous dialects of primitive Slavonic whose roots go far back into antiquity.'** Until the end of the ninth century, the East Slavs had no system of writing of their own, so that all major linguistic changes occurred in the oral language. Then the situation changed, and the written language (originally Old Church Slavonic) began to exercise an increasing influence on the oral language too.

Some dialects of Old Russian historically developed into different languages, closely related but independent and developing according to their own inherent laws. Thus Old Russian gave rise to Russian, Ukrainian and Byelorussian.

The ancient Russian nationality formed through successful opposition to feudal disunity. We see this from the

---

* *Ibid.*, p. 11.

** F. P. Filin, *Proiskhozhdeniye russkogo, ukrainskogo i belorusskogo yazykov. Istoriko-dialektichesky ocherk* (Origins of the Russian, Ukrainian and Byelorussian Languages. A Dialectical Historical Survey), Leningrad, 1972, p. 3.

Slovo o polku Igoreve (The Lay of Igor's Host)* which sings of the unity of Russia. 'The anonymous author of the *Slovo*, doubtless a progressive figure of his period, raised high the banner of Russian national unification, being perfectly aware that it was crucial to the preservation and prosperity of the Russian state.'**

The relative weakness and instability of economic relations early in the feudal epoch caused the ancient Russian ethnic community to disband in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Internal circumstances, the Tatar invasions, and incursions from the West brought about the temporary disintegration of the ancient Russian principalities. Nevertheless, the ethnic ties that had emerged earlier were not completely broken.

'Even during the period of feudal disunity,' writes Academician V. V. Vinogradov, the well-known Soviet linguist, 'when local territorial dialects laid claim to the role of the official and business language in different principalities, oral folk poetry and the language it used were great unifying cultural forces and aids to national consolidation. Folklore paved the way for the future national language. The different genres of folk poetry—especially the epic (*bylina*), the lay, the fairy tale and the proverb—had no local or regional exclusiveness about them. They developed as a popular poetic language, common to all Russians.'***

Incursions by nomads from the steppes and the Tatar-Mongol**** yoke (twelfth to fifteenth centuries), with their attendant destruction, pillage and tribute, bore hard on the masses. Many dukes, boyars, merchants and clergymen came to an understanding with the Mongol invaders soon enough. But there were others who supported the national aspirations of the people.

---

* *Slovo o polku Igoreve* is a great monument of twelfth-century Russian culture. It relates the events of a campaign against the Polovtsi (warlike Turkic nomads) led by Prince Igor, son of Svyatoslav, in 1185.

** A. I. Efimov, *Istoriya russkogo literaturnogo yazyka* (A History of Literary Russian), Moscow, 1955, p. 61.

*** V. V. Vinogradov, *Veliky russky yazyk* (The Great Russian Language), Moscow, 1945, p. 100.

**** The Tatars at that time included many tribes and federations of tribes, chiefly, but not exclusively, of Mongoloid origin.

The Russians' heroic struggles against the Mongol yoke; the rout of the Tatars on the plain of Kulikovo in 1380; the rise of the Moscow state; the policies of the Grand Duke of Moscow, Ivan III (reg. 1462-1505) which paved the way for the abolition of the Khanate of Kazan; the policies of Ivan IV, Boris Godunov and Peter I—all these were of immense significance to the history of Russia and Europe as a whole. The greatest contribution to the formation and consolidation of the Russian nation and the Russian multinational state was made by the great mass of the peasantry and the urban tradespeople and artisans, who were objectively interested in ending feudal disunity. A progressive role in the elimination of political disunity was also played by certain sections of the feudal class.

Out of the Russian nationality there grew a Russian nation. This process passed through several stages. The emergence of a centralised Russian state, between the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, was a landmark in the formation of the Russian nation.

The territorial unity, language, economic ties, and culture of the Russian nation developed over many centuries. The Old Russian language which was spoken in the tenth to twelfth centuries in Kiev, Novgorod, Yaroslavl and other parts of the ancient Russian state, was the creation of all sections of society. After all, a language reflects all the diversity of the relationships that exist between a nation or a people and the outside world, including the relationships between individuals and between peoples.

The territory of the Russian nationality and nation took shape over many centuries. The Russian penetration to the north, beyond the Urals, was begun by the inhabitants of Novgorod as early as the eleventh century. As Marx noted, they made their way to Siberia through the dense forest; they began to civilise and Christianise the measureless tracts between Lake Ladoga, the White Sea, Novaya Zemlya and the Onega.*

When a centralised Russian state was formed, Siberia was incorporated in it. The famous campaigns of Yermak,

* *The Archives of Marx and Engels*, Vol. VIII, p. 156 (in Russian).

who defeated Khan Kuchum of Siberia, seizing Isker, the capital city of the Khanate of Kashlyk, 'laid the *foundations of Asian Russia*'.*

In the first half of the seventeenth century, settlements were established at Yeniseisk, Krasnoyarsk, Yakutsk and Irkutsk, and the Russians reached the Pacific coast. 'Geographically, economically and historically, Russia belongs not only to Europe, but also to Asia,' Lenin observed.**

The settling of the vast Siberian territories was an outstanding achievement on the part of the Russian people, chiefly to be credited to those common people who had fled to Siberia to find freedom from oppression. Siberia and the Far East historically became part of the Russian state thanks, above all, to the masses, the peasants and workers whose labour made these parts habitable. A. I. Herzen, the outstanding Russian revolutionary democrat, wrote in *Kolokol* (The Bell) on 1 January 1859: 'A few Cossacks and a few hundred homeless peasants on their own initiative crossed oceans of ice and snow, and wherever a tired handful of them stopped in the godforsaken frozen steppe, everything sprang into life, corn rustled in the fields and cattle grazed. This happened all the way from Perm to the Pacific Ocean.'***

'The most numerous part of the population of feudal Russia,' wrote Academician B. D. Grekov, 'the peasantry was, for a very long time, the main producer of material goods. The Russian peasant with his axe and wooden plough brought the limitless expanses of the East European plain under cultivation and managed to take his labour skills to the Urals, to distant Asia. The peasant took up arms to defend his country from its numerous foes and gained the reputation of an invincible champion. The peasant—in spite of the extremely unfavourable conditions under which he had to exist for ages—gave his

---

* *Ibid.*, p. 166.

** V. I. Lenin, 'Lecture on the 1905 Revolution', *op. cit.*, Vol. 23, p. 251.

*** *Kolokol*, the magazine of A. I. Herzen and N. P. Ogarev. A facsimile edition, Moscow, 1962, p. 259.

country hundreds of great men of science, art and literature.'*

The incorporation of Siberia was one of the stages in the formation of the multinational Russian state. Siberia was inhabited by numerous nationalities and tribes, for example, Tungus, Yakuts, Chukchi and others. The peoples who lived in the northern Yenisei area were as yet in the early stages of social and economic development. It was 'the period in which the appropriation of natural products, ready for use, predominated'.** The northern peoples were nomads and had hardly any permanent settlements, but their role in world history is great, as they were the first to develop the Far North and other distant places and they had an original ancient culture. The Russian working people—and above all the Russian peasants—brought with them more advanced forms of economy and culture, which were adopted by the indigenous peoples. The Russians, who cooperated with the peoples of the North, built hundreds of villages there. The favourable influence exerted by Russian culture on the Northern peoples is widely recognised. The transition from bows and arrows to firearms and from fur to woven clothing was a great leap into a new world. In turn, the local peoples, including those of the North, exercised a definite influence on the Russian population. The Russians adopted their traditional methods of fishing, hunting and transportation. They wore the native coat suited to the inclement Polar weather, used local means of transport (the reindeer sled and the dog sled), and ate such native dishes as grated frozen meat and dried fish. 'Consequently,' writes V. N. Uvachan, a well-known Evenki scholar, 'even long ago and in spite of tsarism and its colonial policy, ordinary Russians and the indigenous population worked side by side, exchanged implements and know-how, developed the northern territories and its productive forces. These contacts were useful and important, they prepared the foundation for the further

* B. D. Grekov, *Kratky ocherk istorii russkogo krestyanstva* (The Russian Peasant: a Brief Historical Sketch), Moscow, 1958, p. 24.

** F. Engels, 'The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State'. In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1976, p. 209.

friendship of the peoples of the North with the Russians and the other peoples of Russia. The annexation of the peoples of the North by Russia in the beginning of the 17th century was a turning point in their history.'*

The history of the USSR shows that the Russian multinational state formed and developed in highly original ways, with the people playing an immense and, in the long run, decisive role in the consolidation processes. 'The great centralised state,' Lenin wrote, 'is a tremendous historical step forward from medieval disunity to the future socialist unity of the whole world, and only *via* such a state (*inseparably* connected with capitalism), can there be any road to socialism.'**

The long history of the peoples of Russia is marked by great class battles and widespread emancipation movements. Peasant unrest in Kiev Rus and after the disintegration of the latter was a potent factor in rallying the masses, irrespective of which principality they belonged to, thus doing much to advance national and political unification. All the chronicles of the Russian settlements note as early as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that during peasant revolts the peasants and artisans did not act or feel as if they were merely people from Kaluga, the Volga, Novgorod, and so on. They felt primarily Russian.

The great peasant wars—the rebellion of Ivan Bolotnikov in 1606 and 1607, the risings led by Stepan Razin and Yemelyan Pugachov in 1666-1671 and 1773-1775 respectively—and many other risings of peasants and townspeople were a major aspect of Russia's historical development in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They fostered a love of freedom which was reflected in folklore and eventually pervaded the works of the great Russian writers Radishchev, Pushkin, Lermontov, and Nekrasov. This spirit also lived on and grew in the writings of the great Russian enlighteners and revolutionary democrats Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Herzen, and Pisarev.

---

* V. N. Uvachan, *The Peoples of the North and Their Road to Socialism*, Moscow, 1975, p. 28.

** V. I. Lenin, 'Critical Remarks on the National Question', *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, Moscow, 1964, p. 46.

From the latter half of the seventeenth century, an absolute feudal monarchy was steadily established in Russia. The landlords' power over the serfs was perpetuated by a royal charter granted to the nobility in 1785. The peasants' dependence on the feudal lords had been developing ever since the establishment of Kiev Rus, and increased particularly during the formation of a centralised Russian state. The gradual development of productive forces and commodity exchange from the seventeenth century onwards resulted in the extension of primary capitalist relations and, Lenin wrote, 'the leaders and masters of this process were the merchant capitalists'.* This process, however, was so slow and painful even after the 1861 Reform (by which serfdom was abolished in Russia) as to make Lenin describe it as the 'Prussian way' of developing capitalism, in contrast to the more energetic bourgeois-revolutionary 'American way'. Nevertheless, the gradual changes taking place in the countryside and the increasing class differentiation among the peasantry, especially after 1861, resulted in far-reaching social changes both in town and country.

The predominant ideology under feudalism was religion, which, during times of foreign oppression (for example, under the Mongol yoke) often served to unite the people to repulse the invaders. The Christian religion was at first professed by the nobility and townsfolk in Russia, and only spread among the peasants towards the thirteenth century. Christianity was adopted by the peasants as a religion of consolation, holding out the hope of happiness in heaven to make up for their wretched lot upon earth. Having become established in the countryside, Orthodox Christianity, mixed with heathen beliefs, subsequently became an important factor in rallying the nation against the Mongol yoke.

Thus, the formation of the Russian nation was a process attended by a complex internal and external struggle.

The synthesis of different ethnic groups was of great importance in the formation of the South Slav peoples. A

* V. I. Lenin, 'What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats', *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1974, p. 155.

clear example of this is provided by the Bulgars, who derive from the Thracians and a people known as the proto-Bulgars as well as from the Slavs.

Slav tribes permanently settled in the sixth and seventh centuries in what is now Bulgaria and densely populated the territories of Moesia, Thrace and Macedonia, becoming the dominant ethnic element there and assimilating the Thracians. The way for this had been paved in the course of the first five centuries A. D. when, as a result of repeated 'barbarian' invasions, the population of Thrace had been greatly reduced and the country had lost ist former territorial integrity and also, to some extent, its cultural distinctiveness. This was due, among other things, to the Hellenisation and Romanisation of some of the Thracians. Nevertheless, they made a notable contribution to the growth of the Bulgarian nation. Examination of Bulgarian archaeological findings shows that the local experience was largely utilised by the South Slav tribes in mastering new industries, adjusting to the environment and exploiting the natural resources. Considerable Thracian influence is evident in the customs and rites of the South Slavs. Much of the legacy of the civilisation of classical antiquity was passed on to the Slavs through the Thracians.

The proto-Bulgars' contribution to the formation of the Bulgarian people was chiefly social. Less numerous than the Slavs, but with a strong centralised organisation due to their war-like nomadic existence, the proto-Bulgars were a considerable help in winning independence from the Byzantine empire and also in consolidating the Slavo-Bulgarian state. The collapse of tribal isolation and the reorganisation of the administrative system within the framework of an entire state were major factors in the consolidation of the Slav and Turkic populace, while the Slavic language and culture were established in a dominant position.

Pre-Slavic aboriginal people also played an essential part in the formation of a great part of the Slavic-speaking peoples inhabiting modern Yugoslavia.

The consolidation processes which occurred during the formation of the South Slavic peoples were, however, expressed not only in the synthesis of unrelated ethnic

entities—a kind of synthesis equally characteristic of world history—but were also seen in the consolidation of related ethnic units. Thus, the Serbian nationality was formed by the union of the Zahumlyanie, Neretvlyanie, Duklyanie, and others.

Similar ethnogenic process developed among the West Slavs. It is known, for example, that the Czech people emerged as a result of the consolidation of a number of tribes, such as Zalichanie, Pshovanie, Luchanie, Dudlebi, and the Polish nation originated from the union of the tribes of the Slezanie, the Polyane, the Wislanie, the Mazowszanie and the Pomorzanie.

Consolidation processes among the South and West Slavs also continued in more recent times. This is due above all to the cultural and linguistic isolation of individual groups of Slavs, a feature of the feudal epoch which has various causes. Such groups often coincided for long periods with the remnants of the old tribal division which gave the nationalities a variegated ethnographic pattern.

CONSOLIDATION PROCESSES IN ASIA, AFRICA AND THE AMERICAN CONTINENT

The earlier consolidation processes in Asia and Africa were characterised by the movement of immense social and ethnic population groupings. This movement accelerated the transition from the tribal system to more developed and larger societies, in Asia above all. But in Africa too, states originated from primary ethnic communities. So, the African empire of Ghana was formed as early as the third to the thirteenth centuries on the basis of the predominant ethnic group, the Soninke; the Mali empire (the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries) was based on the Mandingo; the Gao empire (the ninth to the seventeenth centuries) on the Songhai, and so on. Ethnic consolidation south of the Sahara desert occurred around certain centres inhabited by the Amharas in Ethiopia, the Ashantis on the Gold Coast, the Yoruba in Nigeria, and the Bakongo and the Baluba in the Congo.

Before colonisation the African peoples were at differ-

ent stages of social development. Some of them already had centralised feudal states, while among others the disintegration of the primitive communal system and the formation of class society were still in progress. Nor were the socio-ethnic units similar in form. Related (consanguineous) tribes gradually united through intermediate links into nationalities, and the processes of ethnic mixing, consolidation and assimilation developed in the conflict between unifying and separative tendencies.

As a result of the Arab conquests in the seventh and eighth centuries there emerged one of the largest states in human history, the Arab caliphate (first of the Omayyads and then of the Abbasids) which stretched from Spain and Morocco in the West to the valleys of the Amu Darya and the Indus in the East, and from Asia Minor and Transcaucasia in the North to the Sudan and Zanzibar in the South. The Arabs intermixed with the conquered peoples of the Middle East, Central Asia, North Africa and South-Western Europe in the seventh to the tenth centuries, and a rich syncretic culture took shape, a culture which had absorbed elements of Iranian, Greek and other cultures along with that of the Arabs. The literary language of this culture, Arabic, spread in West Asia, North Africa and Arab Spain. This culture is called Arab on the basis of its language, although it was actually composite.

The increasingly centrifugal forces of feudalism, the growing liberation movement among the subjugated peoples, and the campaigns of conquest conducted by the Turks (the Seljuks, and subsequently the Ottoman Turks) contributed to the disintegration of the Arab caliphate. Nevertheless, Arab culture, the Arabic language, and Islam continued for centuries to exercise a dominant or a very strong influence on the development of Asian and African peoples. As the local peoples and the Arab tribes continued to influence each other, so a national Arab ethnic community with a culture, a religion and a language of its own continued to develop.

The Arab caliphate, which disintegrated at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and the Greek Byzantine empire were replaced in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries by the Ottoman empire, with its capital at

Constantinople. The Ottoman empire was set up by Turkic nomad tribes from the steppes of Central Asia. They united under the Ottoman Turks and, subjugating the peoples of Iran, Iraq and Asia Minor, set up a military feudal empire stretching from the borders of Iran in the East to North-West Africa (Maghrib).

The Turkish nationality began to form in the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries, when a part of the native population of Anatolia merged with the Turkic nomad tribes of the Oghuz, the Turkomans and others who had migrated from Central Asia. Iran and the Caucasus. Combining with the settled local population (Greeks, Armenians, Georgians and others), the Turks largely assimilated them from a linguistic point of view. In turn they adopted local economic methods and cultural features and settled down. The nucleus of the Turkish nationality began to form in the Osman beylik (the north-western part of Asia Minor). As Asia Minor was united under an Ottoman (Ismanli) sultan and Istanbul became the administrative, commercial, political and cultural centre of Turkey, closer ties were established between the different parts of the country, and commodity-monetary relations grew. At the end of the fifteenth century and in the first half of the sixteenth, the Turkish nationality, with its own territory, language and certain economic and cultural characteristics, was formed.

With the advance of capitalism, the Turkish nationality gradually developed into a nation from the 1830s. The process was far from smooth and relatively slow, occupying many decades. Capitalist relations began to develop first among the non-Islamic ethnic communities.

The Ottoman empire, sprawling right across the junction of three continents, plunged the conquered peoples into economic stagnation and decay. Turkish domination held back the development of some Arab peoples and Balkan countries for several centuries. Prior to that time, towns had been growing in those areas, as in Western Europe in the period of developed feudalism. Turkey itself was enslaved in the nineteenth century by West European countries and eventually became a semi-colony.

Immense damage was caused to the economy and culture of the peoples inhabiting the basin of the Indian

Ocean by the invasion of the Portuguese who, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, established their domination over the local sea routes. They interrupted trade between Africa, Southern Asia and the Middle East, which hampered the development of the African countries and facilitated their eventual enslavement by the Europeans.

Iran was thrown centuries back by the invasion, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, of the hordes of Jenghiz Khan and his successors, who destroyed not only its trade and many cities, but also its complex irrigation system. At the end of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries the nomads' domination ended and the feudal economy began to advance in Iran. New privileged groups concentrated in their hands considerable funds which were invested not only in trade and usury, but also in the purchase of plots of land or the irrigation and development of uncultivated land. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries handicrafts in Iran had not yet reached the manufactory level, although they were undoubtedly developing in that direction.

Owing to the specific features of Iran's historical development, its population was extremely heterogeneous, consisting of a multitude of nationalities and tribes (Persians, Azerbaijanians, Kurds, Lurs, Bakhtiaris, Baluchis). Situated as it was for many centuries on the route of intensive migration, and repeatedly subjected to foreign invasions, Iran came under the influence of most diverse forces, which left their imprint on the evolution of the Iranian nation. For this reason, the mixing and assimilation of the ethnic communities there progressed but slowly. In the mid-nineteenth century, national consolidation was observable to a greater extent among the Persians and Azerbaijanians who lived in the economically better developed parts of the country. At the close of the nineteenth century, Iran became the victim of enslavement by major imperialist powers.

Unlike Turkey and Iran, feudal relations in Afghanistan began to form rather late. The disintegration of the primitive communal system among the Afghans became evident from the thirteenth century, though it varied in degree from one tribe to another. The development of

feudalism and replacement of common by private landownership continued among some tribes during the nineteenth and the twentieth century. By the eighteenth century the nucleus of the Pathan tribes in Afghanistan had consolidated into a nationality, a process which owed much to the struggle carried on for centuries against Mongol and Iranian feudal lords. The national state in Afghanistan, founded by the feudal lords, formed in the mid-eighteenth century. The development of the Afghan ethnic entity was influenced culturally and economically by its neighbour peoples (the Tajiks, the Uzbeks, the Indians).

The history of India in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was characterised by the expansion of the Mogul empire, the last in pre-colonial Hindustan. State landownership in its specific form continued to play an important role but private feudal ownership also became fairly prominent. Feudal exploitation increased on both privately-owned and state-owned land. The communal organisation persisted and acquired some new features. In addition to regulating the relationships between farmers and artisans in the countryside and controlling the collection of taxes, it began to intervene in the cultivation of land allotments. Economic differentiation eroded the community, causing it to disintegrate.

In India, commercial production of fabrics grew rapidly. The artisan population of the cities increased. Smaller towns with their surrounding townships huddled round the major cities, forming economic areas of a kind. Relations between separate districts and large cities became closer. This provided the prerequisites for the establishment of the national market and of internal markets in large administrative units.

With the development of handicrafts in India in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there evolved from within the feudal economy new forms of organisation of labour, known in Marxist literature as embryonic capitalist relations. At the turn of the nineteenth century India was approaching the manufactory stage of capitalism.

In the period of late feudalism in India, nationalities gradually evolved into nations. The nationalities had much in common socially and culturally. This is clear

from the more or less simultaneous spread of religious reformation movements in India, which were essentially anti-feudal. With the growth of contradictions between the feudal lords and the peasantry, artisans and tradesmen, sectarian movements began to function more actively. Such processes developed quite intensively in Sind, the Punjab, Baluchistan and Bengal, where the population had partly adopted Islam. In Bengal, where feudalism had reached an advanced stage by the mid-eighteenth century, a national market formed and there emerged other conditions favouring the transition to a higher type of ethnic community.

The formation of national entities in Indonesia proceeded in highly original and intricate ways. That was due to the extraordinary ethnic variety of the population, which was comprised of a multitude of nationalities and tribes. The latter were at widely dissimilar levels of social and economic development, were territorially isolated, and spoke different languages and dialects. Just before the arrival of the Dutch a tendency towards large centralised feudal states and the extension and strengthening of inter-regional economic relations had been clearly observable on the islands of the Malay Archipelago. In the coastal areas of the major islands, the feudal system was disintegrating and some prerequisites for the development of certain elements of capitalism had emerged. In inland areas, on the other hand, the numerous nationalities and tribes lived under primitive communal conditions.

In Japan, the development of commodity-monetary relations and the growing economic influence of the merchants and usurers occurred at the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century, when craft and merchant guilds began to emerge. At the turn of the 16th century, Japan carried on a flourishing domestic and foreign trade. The social division of labour intensified, and towns appeared. The first manufactories were launched in the sixteenth century.

In Asian states in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the struggle between the principal classes in pre-colonial feudal society—the lords and the peasants—was steadily intensifying. This struggle influenced the

progress of social thought. The progressive ideological trends of the time were engendered by the increasingly public role taken by the urban merchant class, the tradespeople and the artisans against the feudal system. The ideologists of these social strata foreshadowed the decay of the old feudal system and the birth of new relations of production.

The medieval world outlook, as Engels observed, was mainly theological. Oriental religions (Buddhism in South-East Asia; Islam in the Arab countries, Iran, and Afghanistan; Hinduism and Islam in India; Confucianism in China) played an important part in the development of social thought. Religion was part of the peasant's social psychology. The people's ideological protest against feudalism was expressed mainly in sectarian religious doctrines which reflected the changes occurring in society. As long as feudal relations held sway, all social anti-feudal ideals of a better future could only be fanciful and utopian. The attempts to substantiate these ideals amounted to historical retrogression, inevitably confining progressive ideas within the narrow limits of religious sectarianism.

Protest against feudal institutions and the division of society into estates was expressed in challenges to the truth and justice of the religious dogma by which these institutions were sanctified. The most widespread form in which the striving of the masses for social justice was expressed was the idea that all men are equal before God. The drive for restoring the purity of faith was associated in people's minds with the democratic traditions of the past (e.g., appeals for a revival of early Buddhism, early Islam, and so on).

On the eve of the colonial conquests, ideological and religious forms of opposition to the feudal system developed, and subsequently evolved into the religious reformation movement supported by the bourgeoisie as well as by the peasants, tradespeople and artisans. Implicit in these movements was the desire to wipe out not only unjust institutions, but also the views engendered by them.

In India anti-feudal ideology mainly assumed the form of teachings such as Bhakti and early Sikhism, which

combined Hindu and Moslem heresies and were directed against the feudal caste system and privileges. In Iran under the Safawids, the peasant ideology became increasingly estranged from Shiism, which it had previously endorsed, because it sanctified the domination of the Iranian feudal lords. The teachings of extreme Shia sects spread extensively. In the Ottoman empire, where orthodox Sunnism was the official feudal ideology, Shiism was the ideological banner of the peasants and townspeople of Asia Minor who revolted against the oppressive Turkish rule. A doctrine was disseminated in many parts of South-East Asia linking anti-feudalism with the precepts of early Buddhism.

Many of the aforementioned ideological movements reflected the growing ethnic consolidation of the peoples of the East. They helped to propagate the idea that people speaking one language should be united. Appeals to fight for political independence and to put an end to government by foreigners and people of a different religion gained currency.

The ideas of liberation which inspired the struggle of many non-Iranian nationalities against the Safawids were found in Shia heresies. Under the banner of Moslem and Christian heresies, Arabs and the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula, Central Asia and Transcaucasia opposed the rule of their Turkish lords.

In the Buddhist and Taoist sectarian movements the patriotic sentiments of the Chinese people found expression in their struggle against the Manchu dynasty.

Most of the patriotic thinkers of that epoch tried to make their sermons, religious philosophical treatises and literary compositions clear and accessible to the masses. They supported the development of national languages, opposing the monopoly of the language of the upper classes, such as Sanskrit in India and Arabic and Persian in the Moslem world, and so on. Bhakti reformers in India spoke and wrote the language of their own people, among whom they lived and worked. When the feudal rulers were not only foreigners but also of a different religion, patriotic ideas took the shape of appeals for stronger religious unity. When the rulers were of the same faith as the masses, the liberation struggle pro-

ceeded under sectarian slogans aimed against the predominant religion.

Interesting evidence of the specific character of the consolidation processes in Asia is provided by the history of Vietnam.

In the fifteenth century, consolidation in Vietnam was at its peak; this was its 'golden age'. Literature in the Vietnamese language had begun to develop in the thirteenth century. Before the thirteenth century, Old Chinese (Wenjang) had been the sole written language in Vietnam; it was also used exclusively at court. This was the result of ten centuries under the Chinese yoke, thrown off by the Viets in 939 A. D. The first attempt to establish Vietnamese as the official language of the country was made at the beginning of the fifteenth century and was unsuccessful, since the Vietnamese monarchs themselves had recently adopted Confucianism as the official doctrine. The Vietnamese language, regardless of this, remained the vernacular spoken by the bulk of the population.

The cradle of the Vietnamese nation lay in the territory of North Vietnam and the southernmost areas of Kwangsi Province (China). Situated there in the third century B. C. was Aulac, the first state of the Lak Viets, the forerunners of the Vietnamese, whose existence has been convincingly established. The territorial and political consolidation of the Viets occurred during their struggle against Chinese and Mongol invaders.

In the fifteenth century, there was a fully-formed centralised feudal bureaucratic monarchy in the territory of Vietnam; its capital was at Thang Long,* which was the centre of the craft industry for the whole country and subsequently became a major port visited by ships from various South-East Asian countries, South China and Japan. Handicrafts and trade—both domestic and foreign—flourished. Besides the government armouries and shipyards, there were also private shipyards and mining concerns. Whole villages specialised in one particular craft. There were weavers', potters' and smiths'

* Thang Long, now Hanoi, has been the capital of Vietnam since 1010 A. D.

villages whose products were sold in virtually the whole of Vietnam.

The foundations of Vietnam's subsequent economic development—the division into the industrial North and the agrarian South which supplied grain to the whole country—were laid in the Middle Ages. The hub of the Viets' economic life is, however, the cultivation of rice and that was dependent entirely on the irrigation system, the construction, operation and protection of which required a united effort by the people and a strong centralised administration.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Viets moved farther and farther south, continuing their conquest of the rebellious mountain tribes, which had started some time before. By the close of the eighteenth century, Vietnam had attained its modern boundaries. Until the fifteenth century a multinational state had existed on the territory of Vietnam; the minority peoples had been rigorously subordinated to the dominant nationality, the Viets.

The Vietnamese mentality and culture developed in that period mainly under the influence of Buddhism and Confucianism. Buddhism came to exercise a particular influence in the tenth century in Vietnam. It was the local religion as distinct from the religion of the Chinese conquerors. Buddhist temples became cultural and educational centres. The characteristic Buddhist tolerance not only made the Buddhist community exceptionally viable but also permitted the coexistence and mutual influence of different religions.

In the formation of the Vietnamese nation particular significance attaches to its numerous popular risings. The main role in these risings, which were highly dissimilar both in substance and purpose, was played by the peasantry opposing the feudal system. This made for the consolidation and fusion of large masses of the population and often of representatives of different peoples. The movement was joined, and often led, by representatives of other social groups, including the Buddhist clergy. The most prominent among the anti-feudal movements was the Tayu-shan uprising (1771-1802). Although finally defeated, the uprising had significant results. It put an

end to the internecine war that had divided the country for a century and a half. Foreign aggression was repulsed and major reforms effected. Vietnam entered the nineteenth century as a united state.

In the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, when the 'embryonic development' of capitalist nations was under way in Western Europe, the feudal countries of North Africa and Asia, apparently rich and powerful, were in a state of internal crisis.

In the watershed between the Middle Ages and the modern epoch the colonial expansion of West European states began, leading over the next three hundred years to the enslavement of most Asian and African countries, including those which exceeded the European countries in population and natural resources and were also often more advanced in many fields of culture.

There are various explanations of this apparently unexpected turn in the progress of world history. Works by the founders of Marxism and their followers supply a thorough scientific explanation of many causes of this development.

On the face of it China, India and Iran in the sixteenth century appeared to be richer and stronger than many West European countries. Nevertheless, by the time they were colonised, none of the Asian or African countries, in spite of the high standards they had reached in trade and handicrafts, had developed primary capitalist relations such as already existed in many Western countries. The uneven historical development of different countries and regions explains the colonisation of the Eastern countries by the West at that particular time. Some West European countries became temporarily advanced and embarked on the capitalist path before the countries of Asia and North Africa.

One major reason that the latter lagged behind the West was that nomad invasions had put the economic and cultural growth of Asian countries back by centuries. China, Iran, Iraq and Central Asia were ravaged by Mongol invaders; West Asia and North Africa were oppressed by the nomad Ottoman Turks; China was conquered by the Manchus in the seventeenth century.

There were also other social, economic and political

reasons for the serious deceleration of the growth of productive forces and technology—especially the development of weapons—in the non-European countries. The main cause was, however, the bloodthirsty colonial expansion of the West European powers in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

When the colonial conquests started, Asian and African countries were at different stages of economic and social development, ranging from the primitive commune to advanced feudal systems, but on the whole they were moving along the same paths as the West European countries. Colonial expansion prevented their normal development, retarding their growth and turning most of their peoples into the pariahs of world capitalist society. We see here an instance of the immense influence of external factors on the development of peoples and countries.

Seeking to justify capitalist colonial expansion, bourgeois ideologists allege that the subjection of the East to the West is inevitable. One variety of these conceptions—entirely false and, moreover, disproved by the historical experience of the twentieth century—describes the Oriental peoples as passive and 'non-historical' by nature. They also insist on the 'supremacy' of the 'dynamic Western spirit' over the 'contemplative Oriental nature' or speak about imaginary superiority of Christianity over the Eastern religions.

Thus, on the eve of the colonial conquests, many Asian and African countries were undergoing profound change. Changes in social structure, war, migrations and remigration brought in their train—just as in other continents—an intermixing of population groups belonging to different ethnic communities. Kinship relations were replaced by territorial relations, and nationalities formed, although some vestiges of tribalism still survived. The formation of more stable pre-bourgeois national communities was under way. The further growth of the social division of labour and establishment of the national market facilitated the emergence of absolutist-feudal and bourgeois-feudal national or multinational states.

In principle the formation of such states signified a major shift in the consolidation of a number of peoples in Asia and Africa. A process was developing which was

similar to that mentioned by Engels with reference to the formation of national states in Europe at the end of the fifteenth century and by Lenin with reference to the formation of a centralised Russian state in the seventeenth century. They were actually speaking of an essentially new stage of consolidation, when the state is characterised by the actual unification of areas or principalities previously only loosely connected, and when it is already possible to speak of 'national ties in the true sense of the term'.* However, nations as such did not exist in Asia and Africa at that time; they only started forming towards the end of the period of feudalism. These processes were attended by a struggle similar to that in European history.

The most characteristic feature of the pre-bourgeois national ethnic communities in Asia and Africa was their social heterogeneity and acute class contradictions. These communities were characterised by much less stable economic ties, while in a number of states (e.g., in India) there also existed caste and religious distinctions.

Pre-bourgeois national ethnic communities emerged in those regions in the course of a long and extensive process of economic development involving the broad mass of the people. Some bourgeois scholars present the development of states in the pre-capitalist era merely as the pre-history of the appearance of the bourgeoisie. This incorrect and perhaps tendentious analysis maximises the role played by the trading and money-lending bourgeoisie and minimises the role of the masses. In reality, however, the pre-bourgeois national ethnic communities which existed in some countries of Asia and Africa prior to European colonisation rested on the feudal mode of production or on primary capitalist economic patterns.

The feudal relations of production, which had emerged upon the disintegration of the tribal and slave-owning systems and taken root in most Asian and African countries just before colonisation, gave a powerful impetus to the development of the productive forces. The social division of labour, that is, the separation of the handicrafts from agriculture, changed the lives of peas-

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats', *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 154.

ants and townspeople and had increasingly extensive repercussions in society. It also influenced the development of national ethnic communities. It is possible, of course, to distinguish these processes from each other.

The consolidation processes on the American continent after its discovery by the Europeans are particularly worthy of attention. Colonisation was begun in the sixteenth century by the Spanish conquistadores. The agriculture in which the native Americans engaged gave mankind such valuable crops as maize, potatoes, rubber-bearing plants, peanuts, tomatoes, pumpkins, cocoa, strawberries. When Columbus discovered America (1492), it had, according to different sources, a population of anything from 14 to 40 million. By that time some aboriginal Indian tribes had already begun the transition from the tribal primitive communal system (examined by Engels in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*) to class society.

At the start of colonisation, there existed highly developed civilisations and early class states in America, prominent among which were the states of the Aztecs (Central and North Mexico) and the Incas (who possessed an area stretching from Colombia to the central part of Chile, with the capital at Cuzco, in what is now Peru). The standards of agriculture in these states were in some respects no lower than those in Europe at that time, while their giant edifices were among the largest in the history of that period. The cultural influence of the Incas and Aztecs was widespread among the tribes on the American continent.

The ancient civilisation of the local tribes was destroyed by the Spanish and Portuguese, and in many large areas of the continent the Indian population was almost wholly exterminated. Historical progress was accompanied here by incredible violence, suffering and destruction.

The formation of the modern nations on the American continent began later, when it was conquered and enslaved by foreigners of Anglo-Saxon, French, Spanish and Portuguese origin. This conquest was accompanied by

the extermination or removal of the local population to uninhabitable areas and by a considerable intermixture of peoples. The next stage in the consolidation of nations in the American continent occurred in the late eighteenth and in the nineteenth centuries in the course of the colonial peoples' struggle against the colonial powers. The North American colonies won independence at the close of the eighteenth century. Other American countries became independent mainly as a result of anti-colonial revolutions in the nineteenth century.

Ethnically, there formed three large population groups in the Western hemisphere: Indians, Negroes and Whites. After exterminating and partly enslaving the Indians, the Whites brought over millions of black slaves from Africa. Millions of Europeans have also emigrated there over the years.

Clear lines of demarcation between the above groups rapidly began to disappear as the ethnic groups merged. Simultaneously, the Whites, who formed the bulk of the population, gradually absorbed the minority peoples arriving from Europe.

The distinctions between Negroes of different tribes were also obliterated, especially among the Negroes living in the United States.

America was the first bourgeois nation in the Western hemisphere, for it was in the British colonies, to which mainly farmers, artisans and merchants from England, Scotland and Ireland emigrated, that capitalist relations were established and a uniform bourgeois market arose. The further development of the North American colonies was, however, held back by their dependence on Britain which had an interest in their disunity and stagnation. The colonies therefore had to ensure their national independence and unity. In 1775-1783, there was a bourgeois revolution in North America, directed against British rule. In 1776, the independent United States of America were proclaimed.

The Civil War of 1861-1865 in the United States, the chief result of which was the abolition of plantation slavery, gave an additional impetus to the growth of the capitalist national economy and culture in that country. Owing to the changing character of immigration, the

ethnic composition of the American capitalist nation also began to change.

The American nation absorbed and assimilated large groups of immigrants arriving from different European countries. Lenin observed that 'the especially favourable conditions in America for the development of capitalism and the rapidity of this development have produced a situation in which vast national differences are speedily and fundamentally, as nowhere else in the world, smoothed out to form a single "American" nation'.*

Canada fell into two large and clearly delimited parts, French-speaking Quebec and the rest of the provinces inhabited by an English-speaking population, which preserve their distinctiveness to this day.

The nations of Latin America began forming during the struggle for independence waged by the peoples in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, which was similar to the bourgeois revolutions (1810-1826). The exceptions were Uruguay, Cuba, Mexico and the Central American republics. Despite the achievement of independence, the development of capitalism in Latin America was greatly hampered by a failure to carry through bourgeois reforms, owing to the fierce resistance put up by the owners of great landed estates (latifundia) and the Catholic church. The socio-economic and class pattern of society that arose in colonial times was largely responsible for the slow and twisted development of capitalism in the countries that had emerged from the ruins of the great ancient empires. The masses' most important social demands were not satisfied; promises of reforms and democratic ideals were quickly forgotten. This made the Latin American countries lag behind the more developed European capitalist countries and the United States both economically and socially.

Now let us sum up.

Modern science, having studied material evidence, confirms the Marxist-Leninist deduction that the history

* V. I. Lenin, 'Statistics and Sociology', *op. cit.*, Vol. 23, Moscow, 1964, p. 276.

of mankind covers hundreds of millennia; that there is a certain basic unity in the material cultures of different peoples; and it is a well-known fact that social phenomena are repeated (or have a parallel existence) among peoples which have no knowledge of one another—or had none until recently. Lastly, the unity and inter-relation of the histories of different peoples and countries consist primarily in the development of labour, material production, the productive forces and production relations.

History shows that human communities, starting with the oldest and more or less isolated, underwent continuous change, and that progressive development, for all its contradictions, forged ahead towards greater consolidation. Great historical changes occurred everywhere with the growth of productive forces and of material and moral culture and, after the division of society into classes, in the course of intense class conflict.

At a definite, comparatively high, stage of socio-economic development, isolated communities which had previously united into unstable and ephemeral formations, begin to form more stable units, with specific features of their own, such as a common language, territory and husbandry, economic relations, morality, and so on. The antagonistic class pattern of these communities known as nationalities is closely related to the comparatively low level of the productive forces. Still, however primitive they may appear to us, it must not be forgotten that the socio-economic patterns of these communities were established in very remote times. Traditions of communal work are found in even the most primitive, rudimentary economic and social patterns, and have always existed among the people.

It was also shown above that the pre-bourgeois national ethnic communities continued to develop in the period of late feudalism. There occurred major internal organic shifts connected in particular with the growth of primary capitalist economic patterns and social relations within the feudal system, which in turn gradually changed the socio-economic pattern, mode of life, territorial distribution, mental attitude and culture of pre-bourgeois national communities. In some countries such communities gradually developed into capitalist nations on the basis of

industrial capitalism, as soon as there had emerged the material and moral requisites for the existence and development of larger and more close-knit historical economic communities and states.

Transition from the primary accumulation of capital and the manufactory period to industrial mechanised production, and the emergence of nations constituted an immense shift in the consolidation processes in world history. Different peoples did not form nations all at the same time or after the same pattern. These processes have been scientifically and thoroughly studied by the founders of Marxism in the light of an analysis of the prerequisites for and the process of the development of the capitalist mode of production.

Chapter Two

THE AWAKENING OF NATIONS AND THE RISE OF NATIONAL MOVEMENTS. THE INTERNATIONALISM OF THE WORKING CLASS

> Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie.
>
> *Karl Marx*

> Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism—these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the *two* policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question.
>
> *V. I. Lenin*

Nations as a definite stage in the development of consolidation processes and of human communities emerged with the appearance of capitalism. The economic foundation of the emergence of nations was the development of commodity production and exchange during the period of late feudalism, which eroded both the isolated village communities, in which the natural economy predominated, and the exclusive medieval craft guilds. New and broader relations were established and consolidated, whereby men interacted as members of states. The growing convergence of the means of production and the accumulation of wealth into the hands of a few capitalists also resulted in political centralisation.

Lenin wrote: 'Throughout the world, the period of the final victory of capitalism over feudalism has been linked up with national movements. For the complete victory of commodity production, the bourgeoisie must capture the home market, and there must be politically united territories whose populations speak a single language,

with all obstacles to the development of that language and to its consolidation in literature eliminated. Therein is the economic foundation of national movements. Language is the most important means of human intercourse. Unity and unimpeded development of language are the most important conditions for genuinely free and extensive commerce on a scale commensurate with modern capitalism, for a free and broad grouping of the population in all its various classes and, lastly, for the establishment of a close connection between the market and each and every proprietor, big or little, and between seller and buyer.'*

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the introduction of the steam engine and machinery gave rise to the Industrial Revolution in Britain, which spread during the nineteenth century to the whole of Europe and North America. 'The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois.'**

Feudal states were usually extremely fragmented, which hampered free commodity production and exchange. Capitalism surmounted these obstacles; formerly isolated areas were united into one state, with common laws and a single customs system. The state was turned into 'a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie'.***

Machinery, railways, electricity, the introduction of chemistry in industry and agriculture, metallurgy, mechanical engineering—these and other achievements in the field of production marked an upswing in industrial capitalism in the nineteenth century and proved the capitalists' growing power within national and multinational states and even beyond their frontiers. Productive forces transcended national boundaries and became increasingly international.

As industrial capitalism grew, production and consumption became, as might be expected, cosmopolitan rather

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Right of Nations to Self-Determination', *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, p. 396.

** Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, 'Manifesto of the Communist Party'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 485.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 486.

than national. 'In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible....'*

With the development of the capitalist mode of production, the contradictions of capitalism were increasingly evident. So in France, where the peasants made up, in the first half of the nineteenth century, the vast majority of the population, Sismondi, a petty-bourgeois economist and Socialist, was able to see the social ulcers of capitalism. Marx and Engels wrote that he 'proved, incontrovertibly, the disastrous effects of machinery and division of labour; the concentration of capital and land in a few hands; over-production and crises', pointing out the 'inevitable ruin of the petty bourgeois and peasant, the misery of the proletariat, the anarchy in production, the crying inequalities in the distribution of wealth, the industrial war of extermination between nations, the dissolution of old moral bonds, of the old family relations, of the old nationalities'.**

Yet Sismondi and other petty-bourgeois romantics, as they were called by Lenin, failed to see the then progressive role of commodity production and capitalist relations. Nor were they aware of the proletariat's historic mission. Their ideal lay not in the future, but in the past, in industrial guilds and patriarchal agriculture.

As he analysed the conditions prevailing in Russia in the past century, Lenin criticised the Russian Sismondians. He wrote: 'Does not capitalism, which destroys the medieval village community, guild, artel and similar ties, substitute others for them? Is not commodity economy already a *tie* between the producers, a tie established by the *market*? The antagonistic character of *this tie*, which is full of fluctuations and contradictions, gives one no right to deny *its existence*. And we know that it is the development of contradictions that with ever-growing

---

* *Ibid.*, p. 488.
** *Ibid.*, p. 509.

force reveals the strength of this tie. *compels* all the individual elements and classes of society to strive to unite, and to unite no longer within the narrow limits of one village community, or of one district, but to unite all the members of the given class *in a whole nation* and even in different countries.'*

The instability of capitalism, Lenin explained, the development of the most acute antagonisms inherent in it, is an enormously progressive factor, one which accelerates social development and draws larger and larger masses of the population into the whirlpool of social life.** Lenin saw elements of progress, such as the growth of productive forces and the socialisation of labour on a national scale, in the instability of capitalism with its disproportionate development and crises, which are due, in turn, to the main contradiction of the capitalist mode of production, i.e., that between the social character of labour and the private capitalist form of appropriation.

As soon as the capitalist system had basically emerged, it became obvious that it was divided into two opposing classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. This was the more apparent when the working class entered the arena of political struggle as an independent leading force. The bourgeoisie, firmly entrenched in power, drastically curtailed the democratic slogans proclaimed by the anti-feudal revolutions, making democracy nominal and establishing its own dictatorship over the workers. Lenin wrote that bourgeois states are 'most varied in form, but their essence is the same: all these states, whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*'.***

In this situation, the bourgeoisie thoroughly revised the democratic ideas which were the watchword of bourgeois revolutions in their initial stage. Lenin wrote: 'The French liberal bourgeoisie already began to reveal its hostility to consistent democracy during the movement of 1789-

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism', *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1960, p. 214.

** *Ibid.*

*** V. I. Lenin, 'The State and Revolution', *op. cit.*, Vol. 25, Moscow, 1974, p. 418.

1793.'* Now the bourgeoisie also resorts to overt dictatorship.

When the French Jacobins were overthrown by a strong conspiracy hatched by the higher bourgeoisie, the Thermidorians, the bourgeois Directory launched the counter-revolutionary terror and broke the ground for the military dictatorship of Napoleon Bonaparte (1799-1814). Better instruments for the political domination of the bourgeoisie were devised, and the system was legally upheld by the bourgeois civil, commercial and criminal codes, which perpetuated the abolition of the old feudal order and sanctified capitalist ownership rights. This validated a new form of exploitation, one which rested on capitalist ownership and profit.

Bourgeois ideologists try to prove that the bourgeois social system is just and historically unshakable. They deny the historical significance of the class struggle, contending that there exists 'solidarity of classes' within a nation. The bourgeoisie tries to deny class antagonism and class inequality in capitalist society, seeking to replace it with the false and anti-democratic notion of the allegedly natural inequality of races and nationalities. The bourgeoisie does everything to gloss over the objective fact that there is no unity of nations under capitalism, that the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, whether naked or clothed in parliamentary garb, exists in every capitalist country, and that the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are locked in an irreconcilable class struggle. Through the ages, bourgeois statesmen, ideologists and lawyers have elaborated, refined and maintained the ideological system of the dictatorship of big business and the exploitation of the toiling and oppressed peoples, through a system of laws, statutes and ideological concepts, including those on the question of nationalities.

Nationalism, which is vital to the interests of the exploiting classes and which, as capitalism developed, assumed increasingly violent and odious forms, such as chauvinism, racism and fascism, becomes the ideology and policy of the bourgeoisie and the landlords. In one form

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Fundamental Problems of the Election Campaign', *op. cit.*, Vol. 17, Moscow, 1963, p. 412.

or another it penetrates the middle and petty bourgeoisie, and even contaminates the working class and peasantry and their political parties. The bourgeoisie tries, moreover, to pass off its class interests as 'national' interests. It insists, under threat of repression, on 'civil peace' in the nation, and stirs up hatred and suspicion of other peoples. The bourgeoisie seeks to gloss over class contradictions, to estrange working people of different nationalities from one another, breeding suspicion and animosity between them, and it tries to make them see everything in terms of money. 'The bourgeoisie always places its national demands in the forefront, and does so in categorical fashion,' Lenin wrote. 'With the proletariat, however, these demands are subordinated to the interests of the class struggle.'*

In exposing the bourgeois nationalist falsehood of the 'identity' of the interests of the bourgeois and the proletarians within a 'single nation', Engels stressed that the essence of the political ideas of the most 'progressive' bourgeois nationalists was that they 'confused the radical bourgeois with the radical proletarians' and tried to bring the most inveterate enemies together as friends.**

The bourgeois world is one of social and national inequality and oppression, of national strife and isolation. Bourgeois nationalism is a product and instrument of capitalism, used to achieve the class objectives of the bourgeoisie, which the latter passes off as national objectives. The bourgeoisie tries to infect working people with nationalism and chauvinism, to foment among them national hatred and enmity, to divide the proletarians and working people of different nations and countries by artificial barriers.

It is significant that while proclaiming the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity,*** the French and American bourgeoisie invested them, even at the close of the eighteenth century, with a purely formal and local sense.

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Right of Nations to Self-Determination', *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, p. 410.

** Frederick Engels, 'The Festival of Nations in London'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol 6, p. 7.

*** The slogan 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' was absurdly enough inscribed on all French prisons.

Even the French Constitution of 1793 failed to extend the principles of freedom of conscience and equal social rights of citizenship to the population of the French colonies. The bourgeois-revolutionary Declaration of Independence, adopted by the US Congress on 4 July 1776, which declared that colonial oppression went counter to man's rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, did not, however, condemn either the slavery or the racial inequality which persisted in the United States.

OPPRESSED AND OPPRESSOR NATIONS

The obverse of the social oppression of the working class, of the masses, by capitalism was national oppression, the colonial enslavement of whole peoples and continents. The development of capitalism through the ruin of the immediate producers of goods and the extension of the home market went hand in hand with its development through violent subjugation and oppression of other nations and nationalities. One example of this is the history of France under Napoleon Bonaparte. About that period Lenin wrote that the "wars of the Great French Revolution began as national wars and indeed were such. They were revolutionary wars—the defence of the great revolution against a coalition of counter-revolutionary monarchies. But when Napoleon founded the French empire and subjugated a number of big, viable and long-established national European states, these national wars of the French became imperialist wars and *in turn* led to wars of national liberation *against* Napoleonic imperialism'.*

National and colonial oppression and the economic expansion of the more developed countries into foreign markets and territories are inherent in the capitalist mode of production. Even in the nineteenth century, industrial capitalism increasingly tended towards the creation of a national and then a world economy and towards the internationalisation of economic relations between differ-

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Junius Pamphlet', *op. cit.*, Vol. 22, Moscow, 1977, p. 309.

ent countries and peoples. This also had an impact on national consolidation processes. 'Developing capitalism', Lenin wrote in 1913, 'knows two historical tendencies in the national question. The first is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression, and the creation of national states. The second is the development and growing frequency of international intercourse in every form, the break-down of national barriers, the creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc.'*

While objectively embodying a progressive tendency towards the internationalisation of economic relations, capitalism combined the exploitation of the workers and toilers of 'its own' nation with the exploitation and enslavement of other peoples, exacerbating the social and national antagonisms typical of it and worsening the plight of working people in both the oppressor and the oppressed countries. But it also encouraged the consolidation of the emancipation movements of the international working class and the peoples of the oppressed and dependent countries of the world.

In pursuit of markets and sources of raw materials, the capitalists eagerly sought access to every corner of the globe. Capitalism made war an instrument of the life of society, making conquest and enslavement a rule of international relations. It was not for nothing that capitalist international law was referred to in bourgeois textbooks as the 'international law of civilised nations', i.e., it deliberately excluded the oppressed, enslaved and dependent nations as supposedly 'uncivilised'.

One sinister chapter in the series of crimes perpetrated by the colonisers was the slave trade, which assumed gigantic proportions in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It led to the depopulation and devastation of vast areas and the extermination of numerous peoples. According to William Du Bois, the progressive American historian, the African continent lost no less than 60 million Negroes as a consequence of the importation of

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Critical Remarks on the National Question', *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, p. 27.

slaves into America. Roughly the same number were made expatriate as a result of the Moslem-run slave trade. It would therefore be no exaggeration to say that the slave trade cost Africa 100,000,000 lives.

The main suppliers of slaves to America were the British, and Liverpool, a major English port, owed its rise to the slave trade. At the end of the eighteenth century, it accounted for five-eighths of the British and three-sevenths of the European slave trade. Marx wrote that 'Liverpool waxed fat on the slave-trade. This was its method of primitive accumulation.'*

From the enslavement of individuals, industrial capitalism, and then imperialism, proceeded to the enslavement of entire peoples, countries and even continents. Ancient exploiting societies had already been familiar with colonial conquests and the subjugation of weaker or less organised countries and peoples by those who were stronger and better organised. There is nevertheless a fundamental difference between the colonisers in ancient societies and bourgeois colonisers. The Roman colonial masters exacted contributions from the conquered provinces and countries and drew slaves from them for their latifundia, not encroaching upon the economic relations which existed in those territories. The colonisers of the epoch of primary accumulation and industrial capitalism went farther. They plundered the colonies and turned them into markets for their own goods, dooming millions of local artisans and peasants to abject poverty. Under capitalism the colonies were turned into sources of raw materials and cheap labour.

The economic exploitation of the colonies steadily became better organised and the profits of the capitalist companies grew. With the progress of capitalist industry in the home countries, the importance of the colonies as a part of the capitalist world economy increased.

The growing exploitation of the colonial countries hastened the introduction of commodity-monetary relations into their economies. Colonial administrators forcibly curtailed the cultivation of food crops in the colonies and drove the native population into reservations, turning

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1972, p. 711.

the land into plantations for the production of industrial crops which were exported to Europe. In some colonies, they started enterprises for processing farm produce. The British joint-stock companies in India seized land for plantations, and, by importing large quantities of English textiles, ruined the ancient craft industry and doomed the Indians to starvation and extinction. The colonisers also built railways for strategic reasons and to facilitate the exploitation of the colonies, set up enterprises for the primary processing of jute, and so on. A similar parasitic policy was conducted by the Dutch capitalists in Indonesia and by the American capitalists in the Philippines. All this held back the consolidation processes in these countries and helped to strengthen the hold of reactior and militarism in the countries which were conducting the colonisation.

The bourgeoisie which began to emerge gradually and unevenly in the colonies was usually dependent on and subservient to the foreign capitalists—it was a compradore bourgeoisie. Simultaneously the working class began to form, recruited from those peasants and artisans who had either been ruined or were working for hire.

The Western powers' colonial expansion in Asia and Africa had highly contradictory consequences for the social and economic development of those continents. It prevented social and cultural development, ruined the economy, and exposed the masses to a dual oppression, that of the foreign colonisers and that of the compradore bourgeoisie and landlords. Ethnic consolidation was also held back. In the first half of the nineteenth century, feudal relations prevailed even in the most advanced Eastern countries. At the same time, by sapping the foundations of the feudal economic system, foreign capital objectively promoted the development of capitalism within the Asian and African countries.

The peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa reacted to this bloodthirsty colonial expansion by launching liberation movements in the first half of the nineteenth century. These movements were devoted to the struggle against colonial oppression for national sovereignty. The anti-colonial movements at the end of the nineteenth

century can already be described as national liberation movements.

Counter to the colonialists' wishes, the influence of a more advanced economy and of the progressive ideas of the working class and democratic forces in the colonialists' own countries caused the anti-colonial forces in Asia, Africa and Latin America to mature more rapidly. The struggle against the colonial masters aroused political awareness. Patriotic feelings, love of their national culture and language seized the peoples and helped them to unite. Their struggle was of an unmistakably national character. It was so not only in countries where capitalism was clearly emerging (in Asia in the first half of the nineteenth century, this applied only to Japan, but also in colonial and semi-colonial countries in which the liberation struggles alone promoted the consolidation and eventual union of nationalities, thus paving the way for the later formation of nations.

In countries where the bourgeoisie and the proletariat did not yet exist as classes, the national liberation struggle was headed by feudal lords and tribal chiefs deprived of power and privilege by the foreign invaders. This limited the aims of the liberation movements which, nevertheless, became more or less clearly anti-colonialist. Some prominent liberation leaders—Diponegoro in Indonesia, Nana Sahib and others in India—were nobles.

During the Diponegoro rising or the Java War (1825-1830), the insurgents, led by Diponegoro, one of the rulers of the principality of Jogjakarta, inflicted heavy defeats on the Dutch. In the second period of the rising, they captured a large part of Java. The Dutch managed to get the upper hand only in the final stage of the Java War, by concentrating large forces in Indonesia. But, above all, they had to make concessions to the feudal rulers in order to split the anti-colonial front of the insurgents.

The central event in the anti-colonial struggle in the mid-nineteenth century was the great national uprising in India in 1857. Marxist historians reject the attempts made in bourgeois historiography to dismiss this rising as a mere series of sepoy mutinies. In reality it was a popular uprising which broke out in the centre of Northern India

and shook the entire structure of British colonial rule in India, compelling the British to mobilise major military forces to suppress it. The great strength of the uprising, which is justly known as a war of independence, was due to the fact that the British were then opposed not merely by peasants armed with bows and arrows, but by the well-armed regular Indian army, trained by the British themselves and numbering almost 140,000. The army was the source and major military support of the revolt.

The ideas of an insurrection against British rule was propagated in Northern India by the Wahhebis, a Moslem sectarian organisation, and by numerous nameless patriots, both Moslem and Hindu, who infiltrated the Bengal sepoy army. In May 1857, the insurgents captured Delhi and forced the last titular Great Mogul ruler of Hindustan, Bahadur Shah II, to sign an appeal for a general insurrection in India. In June, the insurgents, led by Nana Sahib, an adopted son of the former ruler of Maharashtra, captured Cawnpore and set up their government there. Oudh province became the centre of resistance to the British. The Rani of Jhansi, Lakshmi Bai, and Tantia Topi, a capable Indian military leader, were in command of large insurgent forces. It was only at the expense of heavy losses, after bringing large military formations into action and making a deal with the feudal overlords, that the British finally suppressed the rebellion in 1859.

Although actually unsuccessful, the national uprising of 1857-1859 was of immense significance to India's political life. It educated Indian patriots in the realities of liberation struggles. Its lessons remained in the people's memory and were passed on to succeeding generations, bearing fruit several decades later in a changed historical situation. It acted as a catalysing agent that hastened the formation of nations and nationalities in India.

The struggle against the colonial conquests had a great impact on the progress of social thought in Asia and Africa. Initially, the struggle of the masses was headed practically everywhere by patriotically-minded scions of the feudal nobility. An ideological trend known as 'feudal nationalism' arose, which endeavoured to unite the

patriotism of the masses with the defence of the interests of the feudal lords.*

Elements of feudal nationalism formed even in the pre-colonial period, in the course of the struggle waged by one people or another against the foreign rulers of medieval empires. They were a kind of reflection in men's minds of one of the stages of ethnic consolidation. But they did not possess—nor could they possess—such independent significance as they had in Europe. The formation of national self-awareness in European countries was to a certain extent connected with the establishment there of centralised states and of capitalist relations, which destroyed the former relations between lord and peasant. In many Asian and African countries, the colonial conquests heightened their peoples' patriotic feelings, enabling feudal nationalism to persist for a comparatively long time as a specific anti-colonial ideological trend.

The interpretation given to the patriotic ideals of feudal nationalism corresponded, at a certain stage of the development of the oppressed nations, to the level of the social consciousness of the peasants who idealised the pre-colonial past, remaining devoted to their illusions and ideas of the revival of faith, which gave shape and theoretical justification to anti-colonial concepts.

Feudal nationalism also contained the idea of a 'reconciliation' of the interests of the peasants and the feudal lords in the name of ridding the country of foreign domination. This appeal was historically justified, although its underlying idea was retrospective, not progressive. Thus, feudal nationalism and, in particular, the concept of 'closing the country', of complete isolation from the external world, were designed to conserve medieval backwardness in such countries as Yemen, Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, and the Persian Gulf emirates, and obstructed the spread and penetration of progressive ideas. Popular resistance to the colonialists temporarily

* Feudal nationalism is not a trend peculiar to Asia or Africa alone. Lenin repeatedly noted the existence in the mid-nineteenth century of aristocratic nationalism in Poland, for example, and stressed the theoretical and political relevance of investigating the change of aristocratic into bourgeois, and then into peasant, nationalism.

postponed to some extent the struggle against these peoples' own feudal lords and bourgeoisie.

In a number of Asian and African countries—above all in the colonies—in the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries, feudal nationalism was the principal trend of social thought. Starting from the latter half of the nineteenth century, however, anti-feudal emancipation movements began to spread increasingly among the merchants, artisans and peasants in India, China and Iran. The interests of the rising local bourgeoisie also found reflection in various anti-colonial and anti-feudal ideological currents. Yet the bourgeois elements were still very weak and there was as yet no independent bourgeois ideology in Asian or African countries.

As a result, feudal nationalism retained its hold on people's minds long after the beginning of the bourgeois Enlightenment. Even in the more developed colonial and semi-colonial Asian countries, bourgeois ideology became an influential trend in social thought only in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Bourgeois-democratic and revolutionary-democratic tendencies in social thought and in the peoples' liberation struggles began to exert a substantial influence early in the twentieth century when, under the impact of the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907, Asia's awakening began.

History shows that as the different forms of struggle in oppressed countries (such as the class struggle, national liberation struggle, the struggle between feudal rulers, and so on) intermingle, the parties very soon define their relative positions. Many reactionary feudal lords conclude that their chief enemies are not the colonisers but their own peoples, and seek to unite with the former against the latter. Colonial administrators and capitalist colonisers see that it is best for them to come to an understanding with the local elite and let the tribal and feudal nobility and the compradore bourgeoisie enjoy a share of the colonial plunder so as to be able to use them as servants and subordinates and exploit the people with their help and support.

That was how the British colonial administrators acted in India, where they preserved the numerous feudal

principalities, supporting the rulers against the people and using them as a screen for their colonial pillage. The British, French and American colonisers in China acted in a similar way, supporting the Ch'ing dynasty against the T'ai-pings.

The liberation movements of the mid-nineteenth century in many Asian and African countries were temporarily defeated. This was due, first, to the social and economic backwardness of these countries and the consequent inferiority of their weapons, and, second, to the population mix in most Asian and African countries, where a variety of tribes coexisted. The low level of national, patriotic self-awareness made it possible for the colonisers to set one tribe against another, breed enmity between different peoples—in a word, to pursue their policy of 'divide and rule'. The position of the oppressed peoples was made still worse by the fact that at that period the liberation movement could not yet rely on any substantial support from the proletariat and the progressive forces in Europe and America. The important thing was, however, that the oppressed peoples now had a powerful ally in the exploited proletarian masses in the industrialised capitalist countries, which had already launched an organised struggle against the bourgeoisie in their own countries, on an international scale. As represented by their vanguard, the Marxist parties and groups, the proletariat was orientated towards the support of national liberation movements.

On the whole, a great gap formed in the capitalist world between the oppressor nations, a small group of economically advanced European and North American countries, and the oppressed nations, which comprised the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe and which were in colonial or semi-colonial enslavement.

The socio-economic basis of the national liberation movements among the colonial and semi-colonial peoples was their opposition to foreign political and economic oppression and also their opposition to those classes and elements in society which were in the service of the colonialists (e.g., local colonial administration officials, native mercenary soldiers, and so on) or associated with them economically, such as compradores and their ilk.

IMPERIALISM: A WORLD SYSTEM OF COLONIAL OPPRESSION

Industrial capitalism developed into monopoly capitalism at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries as a result of further far-reaching changes in the sphere of capitalist production. Whereas the light industries were still predominant in the developed capitalist countries of Europe and North America in the mid-nineteenth century, heavy industry, above all, metallurgy, mechanical engineering, mining and the railways, came to play the main role towards the end of the century. Major scientific discoveries and the invention of the open-hearth and blast-furnace processes, the internal combustion engine, and so on, greatly extended the mechanical facilities of industry, increased the amount of power available per worker, and improved production processes. Since the new high-capacity plant could not really be used at small factories, advanced technology made larger factories better off, enabling them to defy competition from smaller enterprises. Concentration of production and centralisation of capital caused the further concentration of industry in large factories and plants. Free competition was replaced by industrial and banking monopolies, which fused, bringing about the emergence of finance capital.

Domination by the financial oligarchy extended to practically every sphere of bourgeois society; it had control over the state administration, parliament, most political parties and the press, which enabled it to exercise a determining influence on the domestic and foreign policies of even the most apparently democratic states. As Lenin pointed out, 'nowhere is this suppression of the working-class movement accompanied by such ruthless severity as in Switzerland and the USA, and nowhere does the influence of capital in parliament manifest itself as powerfully as in these countries. The power of capital is everything, the stock exchange is everything, while parliament and elections are marionettes, puppets...'.*

* V. I. Lenin, 'The State', *op. cit.*, Vol. 29, p. 487.

Under pre-monopoly capitalism, manufactured goods were imported into the colonies, but this was done in an atmosphere of relative 'freedom' of trade depending on the economic potential of the home country. The importation of goods drew the colonies into world trade. Nevertheless, this usually had no great impact on local industry.

The transition to the imperialist epoch also marked an entirely new stage in the development of colonialism. Formerly, there had been 'an economic distinction between the colonies and the European peoples—at least, the majority of the latter—the colonies having been drawn into *commodity* exchange but not into capitalist *production*. Imperialism changed this,' Lenin wrote.* In the imperialist era, the colonial and semi-colonial population became the immediate object of capitalist exploitation which became increasingly barbarous.

Under imperialism, the significance of the colonies as commodity markets abruptly increased. The colonies also became immensely important as suppliers of raw materials, exclusive possession of whose sources came to be a major objective of colonial policy. It was considered of such great importance that colonial powers engaged in a fierce struggle with one another for the possession of those sources.

Another most important feature of intensified colonial expansion in the epoch of imperialism was the interest in the export of capital, which came to play an exceptional part as imperialism matured and developed. The conquest of the colonies held out to the bourgeoisie the enticing prospect of capital investment on exceedingly good terms. 'As long as capitalism remains what it is,' Lenin wrote, 'surplus capital will be utilised not for the purpose of raising the standard of living of the masses in a given country, for this would mean a decline in profits for the capitalists, but for the purpose of increasing profits by exporting capital abroad to the backward countries. In these backward countries profits are usually high, for

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up', *op. cit.*, Vol. 22, p. 337.

capital is scarce, the price of land is relatively low, wages are low, raw materials are cheap.'*

The colonisers of the imperialist epoch turned most of the peoples of the globe into the slaves of imperialism, making still deeper inroads into the socio-economic life of those peoples. The entire economic life of the colonies under imperialism came to be subordinated to the main objective of capitalist production, which is to make as much profit as possible, in every possible way. The exploitation of people as well as of the natural resources of the colonies under imperialism was one of the greatest crimes for which the colonialists are responsible.

From the middle of the 1870s the desire to conquer as many colonies as possible was the chief motive of the foreign policies of the European countries. The years from 1884 to 1900 saw intense colonial expansion. Lenin wrote: 'The scramble for colonies by all the capitalist states at the end of the nineteenth century and particularly since the 1880s is a commonly known fact in the history of diplomacy and of foreign policy.'**

This bourgeois colonial expansion was also motivated by bourgeois dread of the mighty upsurge of the organised working-class movement in Europe and North America. The French capitalists, for example, frightened by the Paris Commune of 1871, went out of their way to foment blatant chauvinism and racialism in France. Cecil Rhodes, an exponent of British imperialism, cynically declared that he saw the saving of the bourgeois order in stepping up the pace of colonial conquests.

At the turn of the twentieth century the European colonial possessions in Africa amounted to 90.4 per cent of its territory and up to 56.6 and 98.9 per cent of the territory of Asia and Polynesia respectively. Most of Asia, Africa and America had been colonised by Britain, France, Germany, the United States, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Japan. Between 1876 and 1914, the imperialist powers appropriated an area two and a half times as large as Europe. One of the motives of their

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism', *op. cit.*, Vol. 22, p. 241.

** *Ibid.*, p. 256.

colonial policy was the desire to capture strategically important areas in order to maintain the colonial regimes and prepare to repartition the world.

The territorial division of the world among the imperialist powers resulted in the creation of the imperialist colonial system which became an essential part of the capitalist world economy, as well as a bone of contention for the imperialists. Lenin wrote in 1916: 'The system now is a handful of imperialist "Great" Powers (five or six in number), each oppressing other nations: and this oppression is a source for artificially retarding the collapse of capitalism, and artificially supporting opportunism and social-chauvinism in the imperialist nations which dominate the world.'* The colonial system also comprised nominally independent but actually semi-colonial countries, namely, China, Afghanistan, Turkey, and Iran. Lenin wrote that imperialism had brought about the colonial oppression and financial strangulation of the vast majority of the world's population by a handful of 'advanced' countries. Again, he observed that 'domination over hundreds of millions of people in the colonies by the European nations was sustained only through constant, incessant, interminable wars, which we Europeans do not regard as wars at all, since all too often they resembled, not wars, but brutal massacres, the wholesale slaughter of unarmed peoples'.**

So ended, in fact, the process of drawing the colonies and semi-colonies into the capitalist world economy, a process which had already begun under industrial capitalism. The role assigned to the colonies and dependencies in the international division of labour was purely subordinate. They were to be sources of raw materials and agrarian appendages of the colonial powers.

The changed conditions of world development at the turn of the twentieth century altered the essential content of the national and colonial issues.

Under imperialism, national oppression finally lost its domestic character and assumed a global dimension. The

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up', *op. cit.*, p. 342.

** V. I. Lenin, 'War and Revolution', *op. cit.*, Vol. 24, Moscow, 1974, p. 401.

division of the world into oppressor and oppressed nations extended further. Among the oppressed nations at that time were not only the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, but also such European peoples as the Irish, the Poles, the Finns and others. At the same time, Lenin pointed out, 'to a *certain degree* the workers of the oppressor nations are partners of *their own* bourgeoisie in plundering the workers (and the mass of the population) of the oppressed nations'.* Using the superprofits obtained from the exploitation of the colonies, the bourgeoisie bribed the 'upper sections' of the proletariat, the so-called labour aristocracy, which became the social support of opportunism in the working-class movement.

Within the industrialised capitalist countries class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie became still more pronounced. The conflict between the imperialist bourgeoisie and the bulk of the nation intensified. The peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie, and members of the professions rallied more closely round the working class. The class struggle within capitalist nations intensified while national oppression and racial discrimination worsened, and the notion of national exclusiveness was assiduously disseminated.

The epoch of imperialism also introduced a fundamentally new aspect to the creation of nations. Imperialism created a capitalist world economy into which the backward countries were also drawn. The entire world system of capitalism was objectively ripe for the transition to socialism. Consolidation in the colonial and semi-colonial countries rested, above all, on the struggle waged by the mass of the oppressed peoples against the colonial system of imperialism and the international division of labour within the capitalist world economy, which was built up through colonial oppression and the enslavement of peoples under imperialism.

Early in the twentieth century nations continued to form and national movements spread on various continents.

We have already noted that states were built on the

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism', *op. cit.*, Vol. 23, p. 56.

single-nation principle in Western Europe. In France, for example, the development of the nation was conducive to the gradual obliteration of ethnic distinctions. Although the population of Brittany, Gascony, Languedoc, Corsica and elsewhere retained some distinctive features, the French language increased in importance as the common language of the nation. The surrender of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany in 1871 engendered a fairly strong mass movement for their return to France. The population of Alsace, which consisted mainly of ethnic Germans, was, nevertheless, strongly opposed to Prussian rule and insisted on the use of French in schools.

German imperialism was particularly aggressive. The German imperialists joined the struggle for world domination when the world had already been basically divided between other capitalist predators. The German monopolies made feverish preparations for war in order to repartition the world under the banner of nationalism and chauvinism. Simultaneously the German Social-Democratic Party was increasingly pervaded by the spirit of revisionism which found faithful exponents among the labour aristocracy and the party elite. In the German working-class movement only the left wing—Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring, Clara Zetkin, Wilhelm Pieck and others—spoke out against the 'Cannon Kings', the big bankers and militarists, against the oppression of other peoples and of the racial minorities in the German Reich, and upheld freedom and democracy.

National movements spread in East European countries, especially under the impact of the 1905-1907 revolution in Russia. It has already been noted that, for a number of reasons, the states that had formed there were multinational. In Russia, Austria-Hungary and Turkey, with their aggregate population of 249 million, the principal nationalities, i.e., Russians in Russia, Germans and Magyars in Austria-Hungary, and Turks in Turkey, accounted for merely 43 per cent of the total. In each of these countries more than half of the population was oppressed by the exploiting elite of the ruling nation.*

* The figures are quoted from: V. I. Lenin. 'Statistics and Sociology', *op. cit.*, Vol. 23, p. 277.

The non-Russian nationalities in Russia, massed together under the contemptuous designation *inorodtsi* (the aliens), were oppressed by the tsarist government and the Russian bourgeoisie and landlords fomented enmity between peoples. The simultaneous exercise of different kinds of social and national oppression rendered the class antagonisms inside the country especially acute. All the peoples of Russia desired the abolition of the bourgeois-landlord regime which supported national inequality and oppression, and the social forces which were prepared to undertake the historic tasks of overthrowing the autocracy, were maturing. The tsarist 'prison of nations' contained not only the working people of non-Russian nationalities, but also the Russian workers and peasants. The ruthless exploitation of the Russian working class and the oppression and arbitrariness of tsarist rule moved working people of different nationalities to unite round the Russian working class and people.

At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, the centre of the world revolutionary movement shifted to Russia. The Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1905-1907, in which the working class played the leading role, had an immense impact on political development in Europe, simultaneously releasing a fresh wave of national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The consolidation processes there were increasingly linked with popular anti-imperialist struggles.

India was the scene of ever-growing popular movements aimed against British colonial rule and the feudal caste system. In the beginning of the twentieth century in Bengal, one of the larger Indian provinces, the capitalist mode of production became predominant. By that time, the Bengali literary language had emerged and the first public associations of a nationalist kind had also appeared. There were similar, but obviously not identical, developments in other provinces, but in essence such processes in India dragged on for decades.

Dutch colonial oppression helped to preserve pre-capitalist national relations in Indonesia, by holding back the country's economic progress and preventing the emergence of major industrial centres, keeping the

various nationalities in Indonesia economically isolated. The economy was of a typically colonial, monocultural kind. Nonetheless, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were emerging. The Indonesian nation gradually began to form, a process made easier by the religious uniformity of the population, of whom over 90 per cent were Moslem. In ruthlessly exploiting Indonesia's natural and human resources and supporting the most reactionary elements, Dutch imperialism objectively induced the formation of anti-imperialist forces in Indonesia, thus digging its own grave.

Consolidation processes in the Middle East, in Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan, continued to develop while these countries became increasingly enslaved as semi-colonies.

In Turkey under the Sultans the development of ethnic communities was obstructed by religious differences, as not all the people were Moslem. The former were in a better economic position, paid less taxes and enjoyed more rights. At the same time the ideology of Islam ignored national features, thus retarding the development of national self-awareness among the Turks. The non-Moslem inhabitants of Turkey, especially the Greeks and Armenians, were devoted to their faith, which they saw as the expression of their cultural, and hence ethnic, identity.

For a number of reasons bourgeois relations first began to develop in Turkey among the non-Moslem ethnic groups, such as the Greeks, Armenians and Jews, and therefore the first bourgeois elements to emerge in Turkey were mainly non-Turkish. This bourgeoisie became stronger especially after the penetration of foreign capitalists, who relied on and patronised it, turning it into a compradore bourgeoisie. As Turkey became a semi-colony of the Western powers, the ethnic development of her peoples was even further crippled. The Turks became an oppressed people, exploited by foreign capitalists while themselves oppressing other peoples in their country, who were more advanced in social, economic and ethnic respects than they were. The feudal system facilitated the growth of Turkish domination over the non-Turkish bourgeoisie. In 1908 the feudal-clerical regime of Abdul-Hamid was overthrown by a revolution led by the Young

Turks. The revolution paved the way for another phase in the formation of the Turkish nation.

The latter, which started in the 1830s and 1840s, basically ended during the First World War, when the Turkish national market and industrial bourgeoisie emerged. This caused an aggravation of social and national relations and invoked rivalry between the Turkish and non-Turkish bourgeoisie. The chauvinist policy of the Turkish government greatly strained national relations, leading to the slaughter of Armenians and Aissors and the expulsion of more than a million Greeks. The final consolidation of Turkey as a nation was promoted by the emancipation struggle of 1918-1923 headed by Kemal Atatürk.

In Iran, the Persians and the Azerbaijanians, who formed the two largest ethnic communities in the country, were the first to develop national self-awareness. Other population groups, especially the nomad and semi-nomad tribes, had not yet been touched by this process. The bourgeois anti-feudal revolution of 1905-1911, which struck a strong blow at the ruling dynasty, limiting the power of the Shahs, was an important landmark in the national development of the peoples of Iran. The revolution roused broad sections of the population to struggle for national independence, democracy and freedom.

Afghanistan underwent a long and difficult process in abolishing the feudal fragmentation of the country, in unifying it, and in establishing a centralised state. The struggle of the Afghan people against the British, who sought to turn the country into a colony, went on for decades. Britain ultimately failed to impose colonial rule on Afghanistan, though it managed to establish control over Afghanistan's foreign policy.

At the outset of the imperialist epoch many African tribes south of the Sahara had not yet formed as nationalities; they were still at the tribal and protonationality stage. The slow development of the productive forces, the reliance on the natural economy, and the tribal organisation of society were maintained by the colonisers. Many peoples south of the Sahara were still at the stage of transition from pre-class to class society, although class

state formations had earlier existed in a number of areas. The people of Egypt, North Africa (Maghrib), Ethiopia, Madagascar, North Sudan, and so on, were at the feudal stage. Ethnic consolidation of related peoples was badly held back as a result of the boundaries which the imperialists had arbitrarily set between their colonial possessions. In some districts capitalist forms developed as more land was planted under cash crops, as mining advanced and urban growth began. This sapped and gradually destroyed the natural economy and feudal customs, promoting national consolidation processes, which were adverse to colonialism and helpful to the national liberation movement.

In most African countries, however, capitalism failed to reach a dominant position. The socio-economic structure of these countries presented a mosaic of social patterns, where changing tribal relations, prevailing feudal relations, and developing primary capitalist relations all coexisted in the framework of increasing oppression on the part of the colonial monopolies. The low level of the productive forces, the poor production facilities, and the policies pursued by colonial administrations acted as a brake on socio-economic change in African society.

Nevertheless, under the influence of commodity production, class differentiation and urban growth, this society gradually acquired new features. Wage labour appeared. This process was rather different in Africa than in Europe, since capitalist production had been imposed on Africa chiefly from outside. In the European countries primary accumulation of capital was accompanied by the pauperisation of the peasants, while in Africa, with its poorly developed productive forces and rampant colonial exploitation, the larger part of the population was already destitute. Therefore, the connection between capital and labour in Africa was made primarily under extra-economic compulsion, for example, the imposition of compulsory work for the colonisers, contractual employment, and so on. Capitalist forms of colonial production and social differentiation developed especially in the mining areas and urban centres in South, West and East Africa and in the areas producing crops for export.

In rapaciously plundering Africa without the slightest

regard for anything but their own class interests, the imperialists unavoidably furthered the national awakening of the African peoples. The development of capitalism brought about the disintegration of the thousands of small and isolated village communities which had existed everywhere in Africa south of the Sahara in pre-colonial days. The growth of commodity-monetary relations increasingly brought the once isolated villages into contact with each other, and that in itself was enough to reveal the identical nature of the vital interests of the different tribes and nationalities and to underline the need to wipe out the colonial regimes and set up independent states. The Africans were increasingly aware that the cause of their poverty, the high taxes and exorbitant prices, and the arbitrary treatment which they received proceeded from the barbarous nature of the colonial regimes. All this was, in the long run, a factor which hastened the development of the consolidation processes on an anti-imperialist basis.

Victorious national liberation revolutions occurred in Latin America as early as the nineteenth century, making a certain amount of independent economic and social development possible there. In this respect, Latin America forged ahead of the Asian and African countries. At the same time, the Latin American republics themselves began increasingly to diverge. This process was attended by a sharp aggravation of social, political and class contradictions. Being situated close to the United States, these countries became dependent in one way or another on US imperialism. The national liberation movement assumed a democratic, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist character.

Such were the circumstances in which the majority of nations in Latin America were formed. Thus, the Brazilian nation took shape in a period which started when slavery was abolished (1888) and Brazil was proclaimed a republic (1889). The long period of bourgeois national consolidation in Cuba culminated in the national liberation movement of 1895-1898, which rid the Cubans of the Spanish yoke. The Uruguayan nation took shape towards the turn of the twentieth century, after the emergence of a capitalist market in the country and the appearance of the Uruguayan proletariat on the

political scene. In Mexico, a long process of national formation culminated in the revolution of 1910-1917.

Thus, there was a complex and uneven development of the peoples of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America during the epoch of imperialism. This development was attended by greater internationalisation and interdependence of economic interests and ties, and also witnessed the increasing international influence of the working class. The historical process of consolidation of nations and nationalities acquired a global character, accompanied by all the deep-seated contradictions and cataclysms inherent in imperialism.

INTERNATIONALISM: THE WORLD OUTLOOK AND CLASS POLICY OF THE PROLETARIAT

In analysing consolidation processes under capitalism, we come across a kind of contradiction: almost simultaneously with the emergence of nations and of bourgeois nationalism, the working class, the exponent of internationalist ideology and policy, appears on the historical scene.

This first became apparent in Britain, where industrial capitalism already existed at the beginning of the nineteenth century. There were almost two million industrial and transport workers in Britain in the 1820s. Similar processes also took place in other European countries: in the 1860s there were about two million workers in France, 700,000 in Germany in 1848, 1.8 million in the United States in 1858, and about 2.8 million in Russia towards the end of the century.

Engels wrote that only the development of capitalist production, of modern large-scale industry and farming had perpetuated the existence of the working class, multiplied its numbers and turned it into a definite class, with definite interests and a definite historical mission.*

The very first steps made by the working class in the political arena showed that it spontaneously strove for an

* Marx/Engels, 'Die Arbeiterbewegung in Amerika', *Werke*, Bd. 21, Berlin, 1962, S. 339.

international consolidation of its efforts in opposing capitalism. This was clearly demonstrated in Chartism, the mass revolutionary movement of workers in Great Britain in the 1830s and 1840s. The Chartist movement was an impressive, if spontaneous, forerunner of the organised activity of the international working class that was to come. The Chartists voiced demands for political and social equality, and called for the unification of the working people and democrats of all nations, and called for the abolition of social inequality and the social emancipation of working people.

In one of his works Engels quotes the co-editor of the Chartist newspaper *The Northern Star,* George Julian Harney, who denounced enmity towards the French working people in the following words: 'We repudiate these national antipathies. We loathe and scorn those barbarous clap-traps, "natural enemies", "hereditary foe" and "national glory".... We denounce all wars, except those into which nations may be forced against domestic oppressors or hostile invaders.'*

Referring to Chartism, Lenin wrote that the 'British working-class movement of that period, however, brilliantly anticipated much that was contained in the future Marxism.'** The movement had a great impact on the political development of other European countries besides Britain, and also on that of the United States. Class independence, political revolutionism, united organisation, and democratic internationalist aims were present in Chartism in a primitive and immature form.

The spontaneous tendency towards internationalism and socialism in the working-class movement could not, in itself, produce a scientific ideology. The scientific world outlook and policy of the working class were worked out by Marx and Engels.

The great service performed by Marx and Engels is that they discovered the force which was historically called upon and actually able to build a socialist social system

---

* Frederick Engels, 'The Festival of Nations in London'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works,* Vol. 6, p. 11.

** V. I. Lenin, 'The Third International and Its Place in History', *op. cit.,* Vol. 29, pp. 308-9.

free from exploitation. This force is the working class. The founders of Marxism never doubted that the proletariat was the social force under whose leadership the social and national contradictions of capitalist society would be resolved. They wrote prophetically: 'Not in vain does it [the proletariat] go through the stern but steeling school of *labour*. It is not a question of what this or that proletarian, or even the whole proletariat, at the moment *regards* as its aim. It is a question of *what the proletariat is*, and what, in accordance with this *being*, it will historically be compelled to do.'*

In the summer of 1847 the constituent congress of the Communist League was held in London. This was the first international workers' organisation to be based on scientific communism and link the workers' movement to Marxism. The constituent congress decided to replace the former motto of the League of the Just, 'All Men Are Brothers', by the proletarian internationalist slogan, 'Working Men of All Countries, Unite!' This slogan first appeared in the draft Rules of the Communist League which stated: 'The aim of the League is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the abolition of the old bourgeois society which rests on the antagonism of classes, and the foundation of a new society without classes and without private property.'**

At its Second Congress, in November and December 1847, the Communist League authorised Marx and Engels to draft a programme for publication. This was the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, the first policy document of scientific communism, which gave expression to the ancient human dream of a just society. In describing the *Manifesto*, Lenin wrote: 'With the clarity and brilliance of genius, this work outlines a new world-conception, consistent materialism, which also embraces the realm of social life; dialectics, as the most comprehensive and profound doctrine of development; the theory of the class struggle

---

* Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, 'The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 4, Moscow, 1975, p. 37.

** 'Rules of the Communist League'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 633.

and of the world-historic revolutionary role of the proletariat—the creator of a new, communist society.'*

Working Men of All Countries, Unite!—this simple and laconic generalisation found in the concluding lines of the *Manifesto* expressed the essence of the new doctrine. The *Manifesto* contained these prophetic words: 'The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.'**

The appeal for the international unity of workers in the struggle against the capitalists became an immutable principle of the international working-class movement, the most profound and true expression of the essence of proletarian internationalism. Engels wrote: 'The proletarians of all nations, without too much ceremony, are already *really* beginning *to fraternise* under the banner of communist democracy. And the proletarians are the only ones who are really able to do this.... The proletarians in all countries have one and the same interest, one and the same enemy, and one and the same struggle. The great mass of proletarians, are, by their very nature, free from national prejudices and their whole disposition and movement is essentially humanitarian, anti-nationalist. Only the proletarians can destroy nationality, only the awakening proletariat can bring about fraternisation between the different nations.'***

The substantiation and development of this new doctrine was the lifelong endeavour of the founders of scientific communism, Marx and Engels. All their political activities and studies were dedicated to one idea and one cause—the cause of the international working class as the leader and organiser of the working people of all nations in the struggle to abolish exploitation.

As he studied the working-class movement in Europe, Marx arrived at the conclusion that, with the extension of

* V. I. Lenin, 'Karl Marx', *op. cit.*, Vol 21, Moscow, 1964, p. 48.

** Karl Marx, Frederick Engels. *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 504.

*** Frederick Engels, 'The Festival of Nations in London'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 6.

capitalist production throughout the world, Western Europe could not be regarded as the sole base of the world socialist revolution. He also began to investigate the economic and political development of the United States, Russia, India and China, and revealed new potentialities for emancipation there. The international activity of the proletariat developed on an ever larger scale. On 28 September 1864 the International Working Men's Association was formed in London. It was known subsequently as the First International (1864-1876) and its establishment ushered in a new era in the ideological development of mankind. The basic documents of the First International were drawn up by Marx and Engels. The International Working Men's Association at that time was composed of different political trends, including, besides Marxists, some English trade unionists, French workers' organisations which were strongly Proudhonist, Blanquists, adherents of Lassalle, some anarchists, and Bakunin and his followers, who joined the International somewhat later. These were dissimilar and often mutually exclusive organisations. Nevertheless, the indefatigable political, theoretical and organisational activity of the leaders of the First International, and above all of Marx and Engels, promoted the consolidation of proletarian organisations, helping Marxism to overcome the trends hostile to it. The congresses of the First International and the General Council discussed problems fundamental to the proletarian movement, such as labour legislation, the connection between the social emancipation of the working class and national liberation and the problems of war, peace, and foreign policy. The founders of Marxism attached particular importance to the establishment of an independent political party of Communists, a highly organised vanguard of the working class, equipped with scientific knowledge of the laws governing the development of society. 'The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie

has to pass through, they always and everywhere present the interests of the movement as a whole.'*

At the end of the nineteenth century, the working-class revolutionary movement became truly international. The class of wage-slaves, the deprived, the oppressed and the exploited, rose against their exploiters for the first time in the history of mankind, as a mighty international force armed with the all-conquering scientific doctrine of communism. In this way history became universal indeed. The working-class movement and Marxism united, paving the way to the triumphs of world socialism in the twentieth century.

With the transition to imperialism, the historical conditions of the development of the international working class substantially alter, and so do its strategy and tactics.

Lenin, who brilliantly furthered the cause of the founders of Marxism, evolved the doctrine of imperialism as the last stage before the socialist revolution. This doctrine led to the conclusion that the proletarian revolution was to be approached not only in the light of the presence or absence of objective conditions for its victory in a country or a group of countries, but also of the presence of such conditions in the world imperialist economy as a whole; that it was to be approached not only in the light of the interests of the revolution in one country or another, aimed against the capitalists of that country, but also of the common front presented by the revolutionary and liberation movements in all countries. The proletarian revolution was, therefore, the result of the development of contradictions in the world imperialist system, of a breach being made in the world imperialist front at its weakest point, i.e., in a country which might well be less developed economically than other countries.

Owing to the uneven and spasmodic development of capitalism in the imperialist epoch, 'socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-

---

* Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, 'Manifesto of the Communist Party'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 497.

bourgeois'.* This conclusion, which Lenin formulated in 1915, was no abstract theory, for he was envisaging the possibility of a socialist victory in Russia, a great popular revolution led by a proletariat already hardened by earlier revolutionary battles. The Russian proletariat was headed by a Marxist-Leninist party of a new type and had a strong ally in several million Russian peasants.

The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) was formed in 1903, under the guidance of Lenin. In its ideological, political and organisational activities it embodied the scientific creative conceptions of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. All genuine revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist, internationalist forces in the world communist and workers' movement rallied round the Leninist Bolshevik Party.

It was an indispensable condition of the victory of the bourgeois-democratic, and later the socialist, revolution that proletarians, working people and oppressed nations in Russia and throughout the world should rally to the task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie and landlords, and solving the pressing national and colonial questions, in Russia and elsewhere, was part of this vital task.

Considering the concrete historical situation in Russia and the world, Lenin worked out the Bolshevik programme on the national question, which formed a part of the plan for the bourgeois-democratic revolution, in which the working class was to play the leading role. The first basic aim in the programme was the overthrow of tsarism, the abolition of the rule of the landlords, and the establishment of a democratic republic, which was also to give freedom and national rights to the oppressed peoples of Russia.

Lenin pointed out that imperialism could never be defeated by isolated peasant or national insurrections. He attached the greatest importance—and history proved him correct—to the class struggle of the proletariat, the best organised and most revolutionary class of society and the exponent of Marxism, the most advanced ideology. Although all working and exploited people are vitally

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution', *op. cit.*, Vol. 23. p. 79.

interested in emancipation from capitalist oppression, only the proletariat could organise and head the struggle for a victorious revolution.

The Party, whose immediate political task was the overthrow of the tsarist autocracy and its replacement by a democratic republic, put forward a broad and consistently internationalist programme. The programme demanded, among other things, the abolition of social divisions and full equality for all citizens, irrespective of sex, religion, race or nationality; the right to be educated in one's own language, ensured by the provision of the necessary schools at government expense; the right of every citizen to use his own language at meetings; the introduction of the local language on an equal footing with the official language at all local, social and state institutions; the right to self-determination for all nations incorporated in the state.*

The focal point of the Bolshevik ** national programme adopted at the Second Congress of the RSDLP (1903) was the establishment of uniform proletarian organisations for all nations and nationalities in the country, and the implementation of a firm internationalist line within the Russian and international workers' movement. Lenin and the Party constantly stressed the need to rally the workers of every nationality in the country, in united party, trade union, cultural and educational and other organisations on an internationalist basis. The first RSDLP programme stated: 'Considering themselves to be a contingent of the worldwide army of the proletariat, the Russian Social-Democrats pursue the same ultimate aim that the Social-Democrats in all other countries set themselves to achieve....

---

* *KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK* (The CPSU in the Resolutions and Decisions of Its Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenary Meetings), Vol. I, Moscow, 1970, p. 63.

** The Bolsheviks were the revolutionary wing of the RSDLP, led by Lenin. The name derives from the fact that they got majority (*bolshinstvo*) in the vote to the central party bodies at the Second RSDLP Congress in 1903 (the first was held in 1898). There had been a split in the Party, and the Mensheviks—the minority wing representing the opportunist trend in the Russian social-democratic movement—formed a separate body. The Russian word *menshinstvo* means minority.

'As it replaces private by public ownership of the means of production and distribution, and introduces a plan-regulated organisation of the social production process to ensure the welfare and all-round development of every member of society, the social revolution of the proletariat shall abolish the division of society into classes, and shall liberate all oppressed men and women by putting an end to the exploitation of one part of society by another in whatever form.

'An indispensable condition of this social revolution is the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., that the proletariat should win such political power as will enable it to suppress all resistance on the part of the exploiters....

'The party of the working class, of Social-Democrats, calls on all sections of the toiling and exploited population to join its ranks, insofar as they are coming to share the point of view of the proletariat.'*

The 1905-1907 revolution in Russia involved mass action by the workers and toiling peasants of all the peoples of Russia, led by the working class. The Bolshevik Party had, in Lenin's words, become the party of the proletarian millions. In his brilliant work *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* (1905), Lenin set forth the principles of the Party's revolutionary strategy and tactics. He wrote: 'At the head of the whole people, and particularly of the peasantry—for complete freedom, for a consistent democratic revolution, for a republic! At the head of all the toilers and the exploited—for socialism! Such in practice must be the policy of the revolutionary proletariat, such is the class slogan which must permeate and determine the solution of every tactical problem, every practical step of the workers' party during the revolution.**

Lenin substantiated and elaborated the theory of the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution under the leadership of the proletariat. He saw this as a concrete expression of the main idea of proletarian internationalism at a new stage

---

* *KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK*, Vol. I, pp. 60, 61-62.

** V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. 9, Moscow, 1962, p. 114.

of historical development. It must be stressed that the Party's demands—the immediate introduction of an eight-hour working day, social insurance and the organisation of revolutionary peasant committees to carry out all democratic reforms, the confiscation of the landlords' estates and so on—were in the interests of the working people of all nations and nationalities in Russia. The Bolshevik Party organised the revolutionary struggle on the basis of these demands, and in its course there arose from among the non-Russian workers and poor peasants some prominent revolutionary leaders who eventually, together with the Russian Bolsheviks, organised the struggle for Soviet power in the national republics and territories of the great Soviet country.

Lenin wrote: 'From the democratic revolution we shall at once, and precisely in accordance with the measure of our strength, the strength of the class-conscious and organised proletariat, begin to pass to the socialist revolution.'* It is solely in the context of this Leninist strategy that the further development of the programme put forward by the Party of Lenin on the national and colonial question must be viewed.

The bourgeoisie wanted to split the working class along national lines. The task of unifying the class struggles of the workers of the oppressor and oppressed nations in multinational Russia was a matter of utmost importance. In his articles 'Critical Remarks on the National Question' (1913) and 'The Right of Nations to Self-Determination' (1914),** Lenin substantiated and further developed the Marxist programme on the national question and the Party's national policy. He worked out the theory and tactics of national liberation and colonial national revolutions as a part of the world socialist revolution, showing that the collapse of colonialism was inevitable, and outlining the principal methods to ensure that the struggle of the enslaved peoples for national freedom and democracy would succeed. In 'The Right of Nations to Self-Determination' Lenin stressed that, under imperial-

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Social-Democracy's Attitude Towards the Peasant Movement', *op. cit.* Vol. 9, p. 237.

** V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, pp. 17-51, 393-454.

ism the antagonism between the international concentration of capital and the international workers' movement became prominent. In resolutely supporting the abolition of national oppression of the majority of people in tsarist Russia, the Party stressed that the freedom of the Great-Russian population itself could not be assured without it. It would be impossible to build a democratic state unless Great-Russian chauvinism as represented by the Black Hundred* were wiped out.**

In August 1914, the First World War broke out, unleashed by the imperialists in order to repartition the world.

The socialist and social-democratic parties united in the Second International*** saw the war coming long before it started. On the insistence of the Bolsheviks and left-wing representatives of other parties, the congresses of the Second International at Stuttgart (1907), Copenhagen (1910) and Basle (1912) adopted resolutions against war. Nevertheless, as soon as the war started, the reformist and revisionist leaders of the Second International violated the resolutions of those congresses and came out in support of the national bourgeoisie, voting war credits and so on. This led to the collapse of the Second International.

It is significant that just before and during the war the two hostile coalitions disguised their imperialist aims by holding that there were 'national' tasks to be solved. Actually, however, they wanted to annex vast territories, to seize more colonies and dependencies. Each of the belligerent General Staffs did all it could to derive as much benefit as possible from the national struggles in the opposite camp.

Lenin and the Bolshevik Party worked tirelessly to turn the imperialist war into a civil war and to defeat the reactionary government in their country.

---

* The Black Hundred was a monarchist organisation set up by the Russian police in 1905 to conduct pogroms and counter the revolutionary movement.

** *KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK*, Vol. I, p. 388.

*** The international association of socialist parties, formed in 1889 in Paris.

In 1915, Lenin wrote his brilliant work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,* in which he showed that in the imperialist epoch the capitalists' desire for world domination was realised particularly strongly through their violent treatment of other peoples, extensive colonial rapine and conquest, and a ruthless extermination of the smaller peoples. Simultaneously, there was a palpable awakening of national spirit among the oppressed peoples and an intensification of their struggle against national oppression. The upsurge of this movement was also promoted by ever stronger ties between the colonies and dependencies and the progressive forces in the colonial countries themselves. The two anti-imperialist currents—in the colonial countries and in the colonies—began to show signs of flowing together. The peoples of the colonies and dependencies increasingly became a motive force in history.

The contradictory nature of the law governing the development of nations under capitalism takes on a new form in this new historical epoch. There is a sharp contrast between the economic integration of peoples and the barbarous and violent methods used to bring about this integration. This contradiction cannot be resolved within the framework of capitalism. 'It is *impossible* to abolish national (or any other political) oppression under capitalism,' Lenin wrote, 'since this *requires* the abolition of classes, i.e., the introduction of socialism.'*

Lenin waged a relentless struggle against the bourgeois nationalists and chauvinists, who defended and justified the imperialist war and the enslavement and exploitation of the colonial and dependent countries. He always pointed out that it was essential to see the difference between the nationalism of the oppressor nations and that of the oppressed nations, a difference which is rooted in the history of nations and in their objective position in the imperialist system of international division of labour. Lenin also stressed that the nationalism of oppressed nations fighting imperialism—above all in the colonies

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up', *op. cit.*, Vol. 22, p. 325.

and dependencies—was objectively progressive, democratic and anti-imperialist.

There is an organic link between the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and the national liberation movement of colonial peoples, for they are but two sides of one revolutionary process whose final goal is to throw off the capitalist yoke and build socialism. A genuinely democratic solution of the national and colonial questions ultimately depends on the abolition of the capitalist mode of production. Marx wrote: 'The victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie is, at the same time, victory over the national and industrial conflicts which today range the peoples of the various countries against one another in hostility and enmity. And so the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie is at the same time the signal of liberation for all oppressed nations.'*

The principle of national self-determination has been scientifically substantiated in Leninism as the right of nations and colonies to full separation, to independent statehood. Lenin proved—and the imperialist war and the revolution in Russia have confirmed—that the national question could be solved only on the basis of the proletarian revolution, of a revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries.

As we have already pointed out, the imperialist epoch has had an immense impact on practically all aspects of the national question. Lenin wrote: 'Imperialism means the progressively mounting oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of Great Powers; it means a period of wars between the latter to extend and consolidate the oppression of nations; it means a period in which the masses of the people are deceived by hypocritical social-patriots, i.e., individuals who, *under the pretext* of the "freedom of nations", the "right of nations to self-determination", and the "defence of the fatherland", justify and defend the oppression of the majority of the world's nations by the Great Powers.'**

* Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, 'On Poland'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 388.

** V. I. Lenin, 'The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination', *op. cit.*, Vol. 21, p. 409.

Therefore, in the imperialist epoch, the national and colonial questions have become tremendously complicated and have turned into an issue of vital import to the destiny of all mankind. The national question has become part of the general issue of revolution.

The doctrine of proletarian internationalism is broad and many-sided. It is based on the identity of the vital interests of the working class of all countries and nationalities. It is an integral part of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy and the theory of scientific communism.

Proletarian internationalism is the key to an understanding of the vital needs of the working class, of all working people. Only by adopting an internationalist approach can one be sure of a correct understanding of the questions of the class struggle, the socialist revolution, and the building and further development of socialism.

Proletarian internationalism has its philosophical, political and socio-economic aspects. Internationalism has been adopted as the world outlook and policy of the working class only by virtue of being an integral concept, including all these aspects. When analysing the different aspects of internationalism, Marxists concentrate their attention on the main idea, that is, on the international unity of the workers and other toilers of all nations.

We have mentioned earlier the changes in the development of productive forces which occur under capitalism and eventually invest production with an international character. The working class, which is associated with large-scale industrial production, the most progressive form of economy, grows from year to year; its political understanding develops, it becomes united and organised as a result of working in large-scale production, and it becomes the most revolutionary class of society.

As capitalism develops and spreads, it brings more nations and states under its influence, first through the world market and subsequently through the system of the capitalist world economy which characterises the imperialist stage of its development. By the end of the nineteenth century, concentration and centralisation of production and capital, specialisation and cooperation of industry, the emergence of vertical and horizontal monopoly corpora-

tions (combining concerns within one industry or between several industries), finally transcended the limits of the former national markets.

In Lenin's classic work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* we are shown a *'composite picture* of the world capitalist system in its international relationship at the beginning of the twentieth century'.* On the strength of a thorough, penetrating and comprehensive analysis of a vast number of facts, Lenin drew the following conclusion: 'Capitalism in its imperialist stage leads directly to the most comprehensive socialisation of production; it, so to speak, drags the capitalists, against their will and consciousness, into some sort of a new social order, a transitional one from complete free competition to complete socialisation.'**

The working class, as the most significant, determining and revolutionary productive force, gives the most complete and faithful expression to this progressive tendency of historical development. Compelled by poverty and hunger to concentrate in big factories, rendered increasingly well-disciplined and organised by the conditions under which it exists, comprised of a mass of indigent proletarians of various nationalities, the working class is vitally interested in altering the conditions under which it has to live, in ridding all toilers of the capitalist yoke. Workers of different nationalities draw together as members of one exploited and oppressed class, united by a common fate within a factory, an industry, a country and, indeed, in the whole world, since they are ruled not by one particular capitalist, but by a whole class of capitalists, organised in bourgeois states and united in national and international monopolies and international political alliances.

Freeing the working class from exploitation is therefore not a local and national task but an international mission, which brings the long emancipation struggle of the working people under capitalism to a different and higher stage. Slave rebellions in slave-owning society and the risings of peasants and artisans under feudalism and

---

* V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. 22, p. 189.

** *Ibid.*, p. 205.

during the primary accumulation of capital were local phenomena and were defeated; one form of exploitation was merely replaced by another. Under imperialism the working class proves itself capable of uniting—and it is forced to unite—not only on a national scale but on a world scale. This unity is necessary and indispensable to genuine emancipation. Against the international strength and unity of the capitalists, the working class opposes its own international strength, its proletarian solidarity and unity. Of all the classes of bourgeois society, the working class is the one most interested in the full and final abolition of exploitation and oppression in every shape or form, in the elimination of inequality and poverty, and in genuine social progress. In this the interests and aims of the working class of all countries and nations are identical.

Proletarian internationalism is the social basis of the working-class world outlook, and motivates its actions. It is the world outlook and policy of the revolutionary working class, not only when it first begins to organise, not only while it is struggling to overthrow capitalist rule, not only while it is building socialism, but also in developed socialist society and during the transition to communism.

It would be incorrect to say that working-class internationalism is an independent part of the world outlook of the working class. It would be equally wrong to see the internationalism of the working class and its vanguard, the communist party, merely as one aspect of its national programme and policy. The integral and fundamental content of internationalism is, in the last analysis, a synthesis of the basic views and aims and the historical mission of the working class. Concentrated and focussed in it is the ideology of the Marxist-Leninist party, which, reflecting the dynamics of society's development, helps working people to form a true conception of the world.

Proletarian internationalism does not consist merely in considering the relationships between different national working-class contingents or in implementing the policy of the government of workers and peasants on the national question.

Marxism-Leninism gives a strictly scientific explanation of the historical role of such historical and economic communities as nations; it acknowledges the progressive significance of the emergence of nations. Simultaneously, Marxism-Leninism discloses the antagonistic class nature of the bourgeois nations, calling upon the workers and toilers the world over to close their ranks in the struggle against the exploiters, against social and national oppression.

To facilitate such cohesion, Marxism-Leninism supports both a consistent implementation of the principles of democracy in the national question and full equality of all nations and nationalities, and opposes national oppression and violence. In the national question Marxism-Leninism opposes both nationalism and bourgeois cosmopolitanism, for they both do no more than mask the capitalist oppression of the peoples, hindering the unity of different trends in the popular liberation struggle against imperialism. The ideology and policy of the working class find expression in the internationalist unity of working people of all nations.

Capitalism is, however, characterised not only by the social character of production, referred to above, but also by the private appropriation of the wealth produced by society as a whole. The bourgeoisie—the class of the owners of the means of production—is interested primarily in the private appropriation of the social product. The bourgeoisie conceals its class interest under the guise of nationalism, which it uses to gloss over and deny the existence of class antagonisms. While preaching nationalism, the bourgeoisie, as often as not, betrays the interests of its own nation as soon as it senses a threat to its class interest.

On the other hand, the working class, which represents internationalist tendencies in the development of society, defends the vital interests of all toilers. The vital interests of the working class coincide with the interests of internationalist unity of workers and of the toilers and the oppressed of all nations, nationalities and ethnic groups. Thus, when it comes to power, the working class, from its leading position in society, guides the intricate processes of the development of nations.

Opponents of Marxism-Leninism often pose as 'champions of Marxism' who merely want to 'adapt' and 'refine' it. Some of them subscribe to internationalism 'in general', with no regard to the specific historical situation, to the concrete working-class struggle in each country the unity of the international and national tasks of the revolutionary workers' movement.

Marxism maintains that internationalism can only be interpreted in the light of specific national conditions. In the class struggle of the proletariat international and national elements form a unity, and any breach of this unity leads to a departure from Marxism.

Proletarian internationalism not only systematically and persistently fights all kinds of opportunism, revisionism and nationalism in whatever guise, it also opposes any unprincipled masking of the contradictions that exist between the consistently revolutionary, internationalist policy of the proletarian party and opportunism; it opposes the very spirit of conciliation with opportunism. Conciliation with opportunism and nationalism has always led, and will always lead, to helping the opportunists and nationalists, to shielding them, and, in the last analysis, to betraying Marxism-Leninism.

One way in which bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists adapt themselves to proletarian internationalism is in trying to pass off as internationalism what are in fact mere general democratic demands for national equality, the self-determination of nations and so on, demands which are also supported by Marxists-Leninists. They also gloss over or turn into mere empty words the main demands for the internationalist cohesion of the workers and toilers of all nations in the struggle against capitalism. Lenin mercilessly exposed such nationalist machinations. He wrote: 'Petty-bourgeois nationalism proclaims as internationalism the mere recognition of the equality of nations, and nothing more. Quite apart from the fact that this recognition is purely verbal, petty-bourgeois nationalism preserves national self-interest intact, whereas proletarian internationalism demands, first, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country should be subordinated to the interests of that struggle on a worldwide scale, and, second, that a nation

which is achieving victory over the bourgeoisie should be able and willing to make the greatest national sacrifices for the overthrow of international capital.'*

Marxism-Leninism sharply differentiates between proletarian internationalism on the one hand, and bourgeois nationalism on the other. The main idea of internationalism is that the workers, toilers and all peoples of the world should unite and rally under the common banner of the struggle for freedom from exploitation. The Marxists believe the international and the national to be, above all, objective realities, not abstract notions or 'categories'. The working class of any one country is not only a contingent of the international proletariat, but is an integral part of the national community. Internationalist ideas, no less than nationalist ideas, are only a reflection of objective processes, relations and conflicts in the consciousness and policies of classes and political parties. Accordingly the two sets of phenomena—the international and the national in the material life of society on the one hand, and internationalism and nationalism in ideology and politics on the other—substantially differ. The difference between them is similar to that between social being and social consciousness. 'In place of all forms of nationalism Marxism advances internationalism, the amalgamation of all nations in the higher unity, a unity that is growing before our eyes with every mile of railway line that is built, with every international trust, and every workers' association that is formed, an association that is international in its economic activities as well as in its ideas and aims.'**

Even though the struggle of the working class in each country develops in a national context and is inseparable from national interests and problems, it is, nevertheless, the higher sphere of international class interest that is characteristic of the proletariat which is why it functions as an integral part of the international working class.

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Question', *op. cit.*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1977, p. 148.

** V. I. Lenin, 'Critical Remarks on the National Question', *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, p. 34.

Chapter Three

THE SOCIALIST BROTHERHOOD OF THE PEOPLES OF RUSSIA

> We want a *voluntary* union of nations—a union which precludes any coercion of one nation by another—a union founded on complete confidence, on a clear recognition of brotherly unity, on absolutely voluntary consent.
>
> *V. I. Lenin*

> The Communists have always viewed the national question through the prism of the class struggle, believing that its solution had to be subordinated to the interests of the Revolution, to the interests of socialism. That is why the Communists and all fighters for socialism believe that the main aspect of the national question is unification of the working people, regardless of their national origin, in the common battle against every type of oppression, and for a new social system ruling out exploitation of the working people.
>
> *L. I. Brezhnev*

The Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in a new era in the history of mankind, the era of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale. Having broken the front of world imperialism, it established the government of workers and peasants on the territory of a vast country, occupying a sixth of the globe. 'Understandably, the problems solved by the October Revolution were primarily Russia's problems, posed by its history by the concrete conditions existing in it,' Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev said. 'But basically, these were not local but general problems, posed before the whole of mankind by social development. The epochal significance of the October Revolution lies precisely in the fact that it opened the road to the solution of these problems and thereby to the creation of a new type of civilisation on earth.'*

The revolution shook the very foundations of world imperialism whose mainstay Russia had been in Europe

* L. I. Brezhnev: 'The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress'. In: *The 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, Moscow, 1978, p. 22.

and Asia. Russia was the fifth largest industrial producer, after the USA, Great Britain, Germany and France. In 1913, it accounted for not much over four per cent of world industrial output and produced only 12.5 per cent of the industrial output of the most industrialised capitalist country, the USA. However, the concentration of labour in Russian industry was very high. In 1910 about 54 per cent of all workers were employed at large concerns with a labour force of 500 or more.

The world's greatest revolution was led by the most revolutionary and organised class of society, the Russian proletariat, headed by a party of internationalist Leninists. It brought together the masses of all nations and nationalities into a single revolutionary stream.

Lenin wrote: 'The workers of the whole world, no matter in what country they live, greet us, sympathise with us, applaud us for breaking the iron ring of imperialist ties, of sordid imperialist treaties, of imperialist chains—for breaking through to freedom, and making the heaviest sacrifices in doing so—for, as a socialist republic, although torn and plundered by the imperialists, keeping *out* of the imperialist war and raising the banner of peace, the banner of socialism for the whole world to see.'*

One of the most urgent tasks after the 1917 October Revolution was the withdrawal of Russia from the imperialist world war. On 8 November, Lenin, speaking on behalf of the government at the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets, proposed the immediate commencement of negotiations for a just and democratic peace to all the belligerent peoples and to their governments. The Congress adopted the famous Decree on Peace—the first foreign policy act of the Soviet state, which became the fundamental law of Soviet foreign policy.

It was a document without precedent in world history, one in which a great country set forth the internationalist demand for the emancipation of the oppressed colonial nations. The Decree ran: 'If any nation whatsoever is forcibly retained within the borders of a given state, if, in spite of its expressed desire—no matter whether ex-

* V. I. Lenin, 'Letter to American Workers', *op. cit.*, Vol. 28, Moscow, 1964, p. 65.

pressed in the press, at public meetings, in the decisions of parties, or in protests and uprisings against national oppression—it is not accorded the right to decide the forms of its state existence by a free vote, taken after the complete evacuation of the troops of the incorporating or, generally, of the stronger nation and without the least pressure being brought to bear, such incorporation is annexation, i.e., seizure and violence.

'The government considers it the greatest of crimes against humanity to continue this war over the issue of how to divide among the strong and rich nations the weak nationalities they have conquered, and solemnly announces its determination immediately to sign terms of peace to stop this war on the terms indicated, which are equally just for all nationalities without exception.'*

Immediately after the revolution Lenin gave the Soviet state the task of promoting the participation of colonial and dependent peoples in international affairs on an equal footing with Europeans and of preventing interference in their internal affairs by stronger powers. In a letter he received from G. V. Chicherin, head of the Soviet delegation at the 1922 Genoa Conference, discussing the delegation's pacifist programme, Lenin underlined the following words: 'the Negro and other colonial peoples participate on an equal footing with the European peoples in conferences and commissions and have the right to prevent interference in their internal affairs' and that *'voluntary cooperation and aid for the weak on the part of the strong* must be applied without subordinating the former to the latter'.**

A stand such as this, taken by a major world power, dealt a shattering blow to imperialist principles of diplomacy. It was in line with the internationalist principle of Marxism-Leninism on the common struggle of the proletariat of the industrialised nations and the working people of the oppressed nations of the whole world, against imperialism. It was also aimed at instilling the

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Second All-Russia C ngress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies', *op. cit.*, Vol. 26, p. 250.

** V. I. Lenin, 'Marginal Notes on a Letter from G. V. Chicherin', *op. cit.*, Vol. 45, Moscow, 1976, p. 509.

spirit of internationalism into the Russian working class and the proletariat of the other countries.

The Soviet Government's decrees on peace, on land, on the nationalisation of the banks, factories and means of transport formed the basis of Soviet policy, winning the working people of all the ethnic borderlands of the Soviet Republic over to the side of the workers' and peasants' government. Without the socio-economic reforms which radically altered the face of Soviet society and furnished the basis of the colossal constructive work that was carried after the revolution, it would have been impossible to draw the working people of every nation and nationality in the Soviet country into vigorous political activity and, consequently, it would have been impossible to achieve a socialist solution to the national question.

THE VOLUNTARY UNION OF NATIONS

One of the prerequisites of victory in the October Revolution was the unity of the working people of all nations. In order to ensure such unity, the proletariat had to break the chains of Russian imperialism and free the peoples oppressed by tsarism, by the bourgeoisie and landlords from national and social oppression. As soon as Soviet Government was established, this policy was put into practice on the entire territory of the vast country and the system of national inequality and colonial oppression, characteristic of Russian military-feudal imperialism, was abolished.

On 2 November 1917, the historic Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia was published. It proclaimed the following principles of Soviet national policy: (1) the equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia; (2) the right of the peoples of Russia to self-determination, even to the point of secession and the formation of an independent state; (3) the abolition of any and all national and national-religious privileges and restrictions; (4) the free development of national minorities and ethnic groups inhabiting the territory of Russia. To exercise practical control over the implementa-

tion of the country's national policy, a People's Commissariat for Nationalities was formed.

This was indeed unusual at that time and the issuing of such a Declaration by a proletarian party broke new ground. The Declaration became the Soviet Government's programme for solving the national question. Its implementation provoked sharp class conflicts, for the bourgeoisie and the landlords, who grouped round the White Guards,* opposed the democratic reforms, clamouring for Russia 'one and indivisible'. Local bourgeois nationalists alternately supported the White Guards and demanded secession from Russia. Both had the same aim—to abolish the Soviet Government and its social and economic reforms.

The Soviet Government and the Russian proletariat, took the banner of national liberation and regeneration in their own hands. Bolsheviks of the various nationalities in the country were steeled in the struggle against nationalism and chauvinism. This was an important feature of the October Revolution and one which arose from the prevailing historical situation. The struggle to implement the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia also encouraged the various peoples to rally round the working class in a combatant internationalist alliance.

On 20 November 1917, the Council of People's Commissars issued its epoch-making appeal to all the working Moslems of Russia and the East, which promulgated new principles of relationships with the countries and peoples of the East—principles of full equality and sovereignty.

The Appeal said: 'Your beliefs and customs, your national and cultural institutions are henceforth declared free and inviolable. Arrange your national life freely and without hindrance. It is your right.'** It also announced the cancellation of the secret treaties of partition of Iran

---

* Armed counter-revolutionary forces of the bourgeoisie and landlords which were set up after the October Revolution to fight Soviet rule. They were routed by the Red Army in the course of the Civil War of 1918-1921.

** *Dokumenty vneshnei politiki SSSR* (Documents of Soviet Foreign Policy), Vol. I, Moscow, 1959, p. 34.

and the Ottoman empire, concluded between the tsarist and Provisional governments and the Western powers.

Recognition of the full equality of nations, including the equality of state development, was essential in order to allay the suspicion felt by the working people of oppressed nations against the working peoples of oppressor nations. Shortly before the October Revolution, in April 1917, Lenin, substantiating and further developing the party line on the national question, wrote: 'The proletarian party strives to create as large a state as possible, for this is to the advantage of the working people; it strives to *draw* nations *closer together,* and bring about their *further fusion*; but it desires to achieve this aim not by violence, but exclusively through a free fraternal union of the workers and the working people of all nations.'* What, then, is the condition of such voluntary association? Lenin explained: 'The more democratic the Russian republic, and the more successfully it organises itself into a Republic of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies, the more powerful will be the force of *voluntary* attraction to such a republic on the part of the working people of *all* nations.'**

In January 1918 the Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets announced the reorganisation of the Soviet Russian Republic, proclaimed on 26 October (8 November) 1917, into the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR), based on a voluntary union of the peoples of Russia. In his closing speech to the Congress, Lenin commented on the Soviet federation: 'We do not rule by dividing, as ancient Rome's harsh maxim required, but by uniting all the working people with the unbreakable bonds of living interests and a sense of class. This our union, our new state, is sounder than power based on violence which keeps artificial state entities hammered together with lies and bayonets in the way the imperialists want them.... This federation is invincible and will grow quite freely, without the help of lies or bayonets.

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution', *op. cit.*, Vol. 24, p. 73.

** *Ibid.*

The laws and the state system which we are creating over here are the best earnest of its invincibility.'*

Although the masses were already aware of their independent national being, the cooperation of peoples still had no fixed form in the first period of the revolution. The RSFSR was the centre of attraction for all working people of Russia of whatever nationality, in their struggle to establish the government of workers and peasants.

One of the first to join the RSFSR was the Republic of Turkestan which was proclaimed a Soviet Republic in April 1918, and in July of the same year became an Autonomous Soviet Republic of the Russian Federation. Early under Soviet rule, however, large groups of nationalist feudal nobility and some of the local merchant bourgeoisie in Central Asia collaborated with reactionary landowners in Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran, who were linked, in their turn, with the British colonialists and world imperialism. They organised armed gangs in an attempt to separate Turkestan from Soviet Russia and establish there a government of feudal chiefs and compradore bourgeoisie under the protection of foreign powers.

Along with the autonomous republics and regions which were formed on an ethnic basis, the North Caucasian Republic was set up within the Russian Federation in the middle of 1918. It comprised the Kuban-Black Sea and Terek Republics and the Stavropol Territory. The Don Soviet Republic, the Taurida and other republics were also proclaimed. In these areas the influence of the Cossack (chiefly kulak**) elements was strong. Following Lenin's instructions and acting in response to the revolutionary grass-roots initiative, the Soviet Government recognised these republics. Meanwhile, the German occupying forces, which were at that time advancing in the Ukraine, the Donets Basin and the Kuban, sought to use these movements for their own ends. They overthrew

* V. I. Lenin, 'Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies', *op. cit.*, Vol. 26, p. 480.

** The kulaks were the rural bourgeoisie, the rich peasants, who derived their income from exploiting hired labourers. The kulaks fonght Soviet rule from the start.

Soviet rule and introduced—as they had done in the Baltic area—puppet regimes under the flag of 'self-determination' interpreted in the imperialist fashion.

In December 1917 the First Ukrainian Congress of Soviets in Kharkov declared the Ukraine a Republic of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies (linked on a federal basis with the Soviet Russian Republic) and its independence was recognised by the Soviet state. The declaration issued by the Soviet Government of the Ukraine on 28 January 1918 stated: 'The close historical, economic and cultural relationships between the workers' and peasants' Ukraine and Soviet Russia make it incumbent on us to align our revolutionary class front, above all, with the Russian proletariat. We declare that the enemies of Soviet Russia are the enemies of the Soviet Ukraine. We have identical political, economic and military goals....'*

As the result of the German offensive of February-March 1918 and the occupation of the Ukraine, power was granted to the local bourgeois nationalists, who were willing to compromise with the Germans so long as this prevented the establishment of Soviet rule. Their fierce opposition to Soviet Government and its revolutionary reforms and their generally pro-imperialist policy exposed their essentially anti-populist character and discredited them in the eyes of the working people.

A complex class struggle developed in the Caucasus soon after the October Revolution. Bolshevik organisations there had a long and glorious history producing many remarkable proletarian internationalist revolutionaries, who worked closely with Lenin. But there were also strong counter-revolutionary organisations of the bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeoisie and landlords in the Caucasus at that time—for example, the Dashnaks in Armenia, the Mussavatists in Azerbaijan,** and Mensheviks in Georgia, who were all irreconcilably opposed to the Soviet

---

* *Istoriya natsionalno-gosudarstvennogo stroitelstva v SSSR. 1917-1972* (History of National State Development in the USSR. 1917-1972), Vol. 1, Moscow, 1972, p. 163.

** The Dashnaks and the Mussavatists were bourgeois nationalist counter-revolutionary organisations which opposed the establishment of Soviet power in Transcaucasia.

social reforms, although they tried to cover up their exploitative class policy by pseudo-nationalist phrasemongering.

In Baku and the adjacent districts Soviet power was established simultaneously with workers' and peasants' rule in Petrograd and Moscow. However, as the result of the intervention of British and Turkish troops in support of the counter-revolutionary forces, the workers temporarily lost power. A long and intense struggle for power also developed elsewhere in Transcaucasia. The Mussavatists and Dashnaks, supported by Western colonial powers, organised counter-revolutionary rebellions and uprisings.

In the flames of the revolution and civil war the fraternal peoples of the former Russian empire were welded together into one family. The class struggle of the proletariat and toiling peasants merged with the national liberation struggle conducted by the working people in the national republics, territories and districts.

Lenin attached fundamental significance to the implementation of Soviet policy on the recognition of the equal rights of the peoples of Russia. In December 1918 the government of the RSFSR issued a decree, signed by Lenin, recognising the independence of the Latvian Soviet Republic. Simultaneously the independence of the Estonian and Lithuanian Soviet Republics was proclaimed, and both became members of the Soviet Russian Republic. Soon after that, however, the Baltic Soviet Republics were occupied by German troops, who helped the nationalist bourgeoisie to establish its own government there.

The recognition of the right of nations to self-determination was a question of great importance to Russia. The Programme of the RSDLP, adopted at its Second Congress in 1903, already contained a clause on the right of nations to self-determination up to and including secession and the formation of independent states.

Shortly before the First World War, Lenin wrote: 'The self-determination of nations means the political separation of these nations from alien national bodies, and the formation of an independent national state.'* And

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Right of Nations to Self-Determination', *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, p. 397.

further: 'While recognising equality and equal rights to a national state, it [the proletariat— *V.S.*] values above all and places foremost the alliance of the proletarians of all nations, and assesses any national demand, any national separation, *from the angle* of the workers' class struggle.'*

Practically on the eve of the October Revolution (19-21 October 1917, New Style), Lenin pointed out in his 'Revision of the Party Programme': 'The Party which uses the Great-Russian language, is obliged to recognise the right to secede. When we win power, we shall immediately and unconditionally recognise this right for Finland, the Ukraine, Armenia, and any other nationality oppressed by tsarism (and the Great-Russian bourgeoisie). On the other hand, we do not at all favour secession. We want as vast a state, as close an alliance of the greatest possible number of nations who are neighbours of the Great Russians; we desire this in the interests of democracy and socialism, to attract into the struggle of the proletariat the greatest number of the working people of different nations. We desire *proletarian revolutionary* unity, *unification*, and not secession. We desire *revolutionary* unification; that is why our slogan does not call for unification of all states in general, for the social revolution demands the unification *only* of those states which have gone over or are going over to socialism, colonies which are gaining their freedom, etc. We want *free* unification; that is why we must recognise the right to secede (without freedom to secede, unification cannot be called free). The more so must we recognise the right of secession, because tsarism and the Great-Russian bourgeoisie have by their oppression left great bitterness and distrust of the Great Russians generally in the hearts of the neighbouring nations, and these must be eradicated *by deeds* and not by words.'**

After the victorious October Revolution, this question was tackled in practical terms, in the course of a fierce class struggle. Thus in December 1917, the Finnish Diet adopted a decision on Finland's political separation from Russia and appealed to the Soviet Government to accept

---

* *Ibid.*, p. 411.

** V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. 26, pp. 175-76.

this decision. In January 1918 Finland received political independence. A victorious proletarian revolution took place in Finland the same month and a revolutionary government was formed. On 1 March 1918 the RSFSR and the Finnish Socialist Workers' Republic signed a treaty of friendship. Early in May, however, the Finnish bourgeoisie, assisted by German troops, came to power and from then on Finland developed as a bourgeois country.

In June 1918, an assembly of representatives of the Uriankhai Territory declared the independence of Tuva, formerly a protectorate of tsarist Russia. The Soviet Government recognised the decision, and Tuva was constituted as an independent state maintaining relations with Soviet Russia under international law. But Tuva became a people's state, developed towards socialism, and in 1944 re-entered the Soviet Union in accordance with the Tuvinians' freely expressed desire.

In August 1918 the Soviet Government recognised the independence of Poland.

The exploiting classes overthrown by the Great October Revolution fought in tooth and nail. The young Soviet Republic was forced to engage in a fierce civil war and to resist foreign intervention for three years. The counter-revolutionary forces sought to restore the government of capitalists and landlords, to take land away from the peasants, and abolish all the democratic gains made by the working people. These attempts were smashed by the strong united action of the workers and peasants of all the peoples in the country, guided by Lenin's Party. The defeat suffered by the White Guard and bourgeois nationalist armies and armed gangs, and the foreign interventionists who aided and abetted them, was due, in the long run, to united action on a social, class basis.

At the end of the Civil War, there were six independent Soviet Socialist Republics on the territory of the former Russian empire: the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia.

During the period of civil war and foreign armed intervention the Soviet republics formed a military-political alliance and also pursued a joint foreign policy. In the period of peaceful construction that followed, the

organisation of economic relations between the republics became a priority task.

The workers' and peasants' government inherited an onerous legacy from tsarism. Economic and cultural levels were low; agriculture was extremely backward, based on primitive techniques (three-course rotation) and implements (the wooden plough, the mattock) and the ethnic borderlands even lagged behind that. The country was ruined after four years of imperialist war followed by three years of civil war. Most of the mills and factories were at a standstill, the ore mines and collieries were destroyed, transport was dislocated. The 1922 gross national product was half that of 1913. Bad crop failure in 1920 and 1921, especially in the Volga area, and the general dislocation in the country resulted in famine in a number of districts. The class enemies, defeated on the field of battle, now instigated rebellions (the Kronstadt mutiny in March 1921, a rebellion in the Tambov region, and so on), and took up arms to fight Soviet power in the economic, political and cultural sectors. There also remained the threat of armed invasions by the capitalist countries which surrounded the Soviet Republics on all sides.

Such were the circumstances in which the Party launched its massive plan for the construction of socialism. While considering the defence of Soviet rule to be of paramount importance, the Party attached equal significance to the reorganisation of social relations on socialist principles, to the expansion of the socialist economy and to an increase in labour efficiency. Lenin wrote in May 1921 that the Soviet Republics were exercising their influence on the international revolution at that time mainly through their economic policy, which gave the struggle in that field an international dimension and lent exceptional importance to economic development.

The building of socialism was launched throughout almost the entire territory of the former Russian empire, including its ethnic borderlands; therefore the solution of the national question inherited from bourgeois-landowning tsarist Russia became a paramount task for the working class of the Soviet state and its Leninist Party. The tsarist authorities had fostered a regime of national

inequality, strife, isolation and oppression, often of a nakedly colonial character (in Turkestan and Kazakhstan, etc.). In political terms, all that was over and done with. The early decrees of the Soviet Government had established the political equality of all working people, irrespective of their nationality, but political equality was not enough. Real equality, that is, economic equality of all nations and nationalities had to be attained in order to build socialism.

Levels of socio-economic development differed. Those areas that were populated by Slavonic peoples—Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians—and the Baltic and Transcaucasian peoples were comparatively more advanced. They had passed through a period of industrial capitalism and were clearly differentiated into classes. However, Lenin said in 1921: 'Look at the map of the RSFSR. There is room for dozens of large civilised states in those vast areas which lie to the north of Vologda, the south-east of Rostov-on-Don and Saratov, the south of Orenburg and Omsk, and the north of Tomsk. They are a realm of patriarchalism, and semi- and downright barbarism. And what about the peasant backwoods of the rest of Russia, where scores of versts of country track, or rather of trackless country, lie between the villages and the railways, i.e., the material link with the big cities, large-scale industry, capitalism and culture? Isn't that also an area of wholesale patriarchalism ... and semi-barbarism?'*

The Turkic population numbering about 25 millions (the people of Turkestan, the larger part of Azerbaijan, and Daghestan, the mountain dwellers, the Tatars, the Bashkirs, the Kirghiz and others) had not yet passed through the capitalist stage. They had no industrial proletariat of their own, or none to speak of. Most of them were nomad stockbreeders, at the patriarchal-tribal stage of social development (as in Kirghizia, Bashkiria and the North Caucasus), while others retained some vestiges of a semi-patriarchal, feudal mode of existence (as in

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Tax in Kind', *op. cit.*, Vol. 32, Moscow, 1965, pp. 349-50.

Azerbaijan and the Crimea). But they had already been drawn into the common stream of Soviet development.

There were also other ethnic groups in the country, such as national minorities (e.g., Poles, Jews and others), who often had no definite territory of their own and constituted a minority, embedded here and there in the compact mass of a different people.

The republics and areas populated by non-Russians were usually substantially behind the central parts of Russia in economic terms. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the USSR, Leonid Brezhnev said: 'In economic development Central Asia and Kazakhstan were on a level quite usual for colonial countries.'* Such was the consequence of tsarist national and colonial policy. One can form a general idea of the backward state of Russia's ethnic borderlands from the table below.

The Economic Inequality of the Peoples of Pre-revolutionary Russia (1914)

Area	Basic industries gross output per annum per head (roubles)	Workers per 10,000 population
National Average	30	143
Central Industrial Area	82	480
Central-Black Earth Area	17	70
Petersburg Gubernia	164	610
Akmolinsk Region	9	30
The Urals Region	6	5
Semipalatinsk Region	5	20
Syr Darya Region	3	10
Semirechensk Region	0.9	5
Turgai Region	0.8	2

Under tsarism, the ethnic borderland of the country were either wholly or partially devoid of industry. They supplied the central gubernias with cotton, wool, farm produce and some minerals (e.g., oil from Baku and Grozny, non-ferrous metals from Kazakhstan, Armenia and North Ossetia, and manganese from Georgia). It was forbidden to build textile mills in Turkestan, the main

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 62.

supplier of cotton; indeed, there was not one such mill there before the revolution. The borderlands of Russia were nothing but colonies or semi-colonies, treated as suppliers of raw materials which were sent to be processed in the central part of the country. In this respect Turkestan suffered particularly badly. This ensured the continued backwardness of the ethnic borderlands and it prevented the emergence, let alone the development, of an industrial proletariat there.

Bringing the peoples of these areas up to an advanced level was a difficult task. Disinterested gratuitous aid rendered to the backward by the more developed peoples, above all by the Russian people, was evidence of the establishment of inter-national relations of a new kind. Lenin wrote: 'There has not been—nor can there be—a government in Russia other than the Soviet Government prepared to make such concessions and sacrifices in relation to nationalities within our state, and also to those which had joined the Russian empire.'*

The national question was inseparably bound up with the restoration of the young Soviet economy and the elimination of the economic inequality of the oppressed peoples of Russia. The Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), held in 1921, discussed the national question and resolved to eliminate gradually all vestiges of national inequality in the social and economic field, and, above all, to set up industries in the borderlands, installing factories closer to the sources of raw material in Turkestan, Bashkiria, Kirghizia and the Caucasus (for example, textiles, wool, and leather) to help these backward areas to catch up with central Russia.

To speed up the elimination of economic inequality, the Tenth Party Congress considered it necessary to develop and strengthen Soviet government bodies and those economic bodies and agencies which conducted their business in the local language, to develop and build up the local courts, press, schools, theatres and so on, and to step up the training of local personnel.

The programme outlined at the Congress specifically

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Ninth All-Russia Congress of Soviets', *op. cit.*, Vol. 33, p. 148.

stressed the necessity (1) to enlist the comparatively small local proletarian element into the Communist Party and Soviet activities, to develop a national working class, (2) to develop the Soviet state system after a pattern suitable to the national traditions of the local people, and to develop government bodies and cultural and educational establishments using the native language, (3) to organise the economic activities of the local poor so as to promote their transition from backward to more advanced economic patterns, that is, from nomadism to farming, from craft industry producing for the market to cooperatives working for the Soviet state (drawing the semi-proletarian artisans into trade unions), from producers' semi-cooperatives to factories, from small farming to plan-regulated cultivation of the land.

Special attention was paid to the approximately six million Kirghizes, Bashkirs, Chechens, the inhabitants of South Turkestan, Ossets and Ingushes whose lands had been colonised before the revolution. 'The policy of tsarism, of the landlords and the bourgeoisie, was to install here as many rich Russian peasants and Cossacks as possible, so as to have in them a reliable support of further colonisation. The result of this policy has been the gradual extinction of the natives (Kirghizes, Bashkirs), who were driven out into the wilds. The Party's task with respect to the working people of these nationalities ... is to join their efforts with those of the local working people of Russian nationality in ridding themselves of the kulaks in general, and the rapacious Great-Russian kulaks in particular, and to help them in every possible way to throw the kulak colonisers off their backs, thereby ensuring them the use of suitable land so that they can lead a human existence.'*

Lenin gave fundamentally important advice on the need to exercise a very cautious, tactful and patient approach to the development of new social relations in the republics and areas where no clear differentiation between the main labouring classes of the local population and the exploiter elements had as yet occurred. Finding intermediate links in the transition from the existing socio-economic situa-

* *KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh...*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1970, p. 254.

tion to the higher stages of the development of society is an intricate and difficult process. In order to retain the support of the masses, the party of the proletariat had to pay attention to specific local conditions not only in backward countries, but often also in developed countries where the proletariat could still be under the influence of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Thus, emphasising the importance of setting up the Soviet Caucasian Republics, Lenin explained what methods should be employed in that particular case. He wrote: 'You will need to practise more moderation and caution, and show more readiness to make concessions to the petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, and particularly the peasantry. You must make the swiftest, most intense and all possible economic use of the capitalist West through a policy of concessions and trade....

'This must be done on a wide scale, with firmness, skill and circumspection, and it must be utilised to the utmost for improving the conditions of the workers and peasants, and for enlisting the intelligentsia in the work of economic construction.... You must exert every effort to develop the productive forces of your rich land, your water resources and irrigation which is especially important as a means of advancing agriculture and livestock farming.'*

The implementation of this Leninist national policy was obstructed by Great-Power chauvinists and local nationalists. It was necessary to fight them, especially Great-Power chauvinism, as the chief menace which threatened to shatter the unity of the peoples who had rallied under the banner of internationalism in the struggle for the socialist revolution.

Accordingly the Communist Party Programme, adopted in 1919, stated: 'The proletariat of the former oppressor nations must be particularly careful and particularly attentive to the survivals of national feeling among the working people of the oppressed or disadvantaged nations. Such a policy alone can provide conditions for

* V. I. Lenin, 'To the Comrades Communists of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, Daghestan, and the Mountaineer Republic', *op. cit.*, Vol. 32, p. 317.

really durable voluntary union by the nationally heterogeneous elements of the international proletariat, as the unification of a number of national Soviet republics round Soviet Russia has shown.'*

This programme could not be carried out without overcoming the distrust of other nations and nationalities that the working people had inherited from feudalism and capitalism, which required a consistent and undeviating proletarian policy on the national question, now that the historical circumstances had changed and state power belonged to the proletariat.

The Russian working class, led by the Leninist Party, helped dozens of nationalities to overcome their economic and cultural backwardness and attain socialism through by-passing the capitalist stage, in no more time than it had taken the developed central areas of Russia to achieve the same thing. The implementation of the Leninist internationalist policy towards the ethnic borderlands was one of the key factors to which the multinational state owed its continued existence and strength.

The implementation by Soviet Russia of the Leninist programme which requires that the backward peoples should be brought up to the level of the more advanced conclusively demonstrated that this problem can be solved only in the context of socialism. The Russian proletariat and its Party had to blaze the trail. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the USSR, Leonid Brezhnev said: 'This task could be successfully carried out only if massive, all-round assistance were given to the once oppressed nations and nationalities by the more advanced parts of the country, above all, by the Russian people and its working class.

'Such assistance, the readiness to put in a great effort and even, putting it plainly, to make sacrifices so as to overcome the backwardness of the outlying national areas and help them to develop faster was the behest that Lenin required the proletariat of Russia to perform as a prime internationalist duty. The Russian working class and the Russian people have fulfilled this duty with honour. This was, in effect, a great achievement by a whole class, a

* *KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh...*, Vol. 2, pp. 45-46.

whole people, performed in the name of internationalism. This heroic exploit will never be forgotten by the peoples of our country.'*

THE INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT OF SOLIDARITY WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

The revolutionary upsurge which spread all over the world after the 1917 October Revolution was inseparably bound up with the international movement of solidarity with Soviet Russia, with the immediate participation of internationalists in different countries in the war against the foreign interventionists and the White Guards who were out to crush the young Soviet Republic.

The imperialists were aware of the great influence exerted by the country of the victorious proletariat, and of the formidable threat it posed to the capitalist world. 'Their only worry is to prevent the sparks of our fire from falling on their roofs,' Lenin wrote.**

Diplomatic interference in Russia's internal affairs was followed by direct intervention, the export of counter-revolution by the imperialists who covered up their actions by slanderous allegations of the 'export of revolution', 'plots', and 'subversion from Moscow'.

In that period of imminent peril, the Soviet people was supported by the working people of other countries. A movement of solidarity with Soviet Russia began, which was closely linked with the struggles being waged by working people in various countries to achieve their demands—democracy, better living standards, and peace.

The New York Socialists sent a message to the workers of Germany and Austria-Hungary, asking them to exert every effort to oppose their rulers, who were seeking to crush the Russian revolution. They wrote that the German invasion of Russia was a death blow to the labour democracy in all countries.*** The message sent by a Berne

---

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 63.

** V. I. Lenin, 'Speech to Propagandists on Their Way to the Provinces. January 23 (February 5), 1918', *op. cit.*, Vol. 26, p. 513.

*** *Proletarskaya solidarnost trudyashchikhsya v borbe za mir (1917-1924). Dokumenty i materialy* (The Proletarian Solidarity of Working People in

trade union conference to the Russian proletariat voiced the appeal of the Swiss workers to the organised workers in all countries to use every means to resist the aim of all lawless governments to defeat the Republic of workers and peasants.* The Central Committee of the Italian Socialist Party resolved, in September 1918, to ask the Italian proletariat as a body to state that it was profoundly in sympathy with the Russian revolution and to protest against the imperialist attacks it was being subjected to.**

Workers' meetings, mass rallies and conferences held in various countries demanded an end to the war and to the armed intervention in Soviet Russia. These slogans were used at demonstrations by workers, farmers, servicemen and seamen in Europe and America. The proletariat of different nations and nationalities considered the defence of the Soviet state and the gains of the Great October Socialist Revolution to be its immediate class duty. The movement of solidarity with Soviet Russia and for its defence spread over many countries. People refused to fight against Russia, to make or ship arms that would be used against Russia. Strikes were frequent. The interventionists' plans were running aground.

The international proletariat urgently demanded: 'Hands off Soviet Russia'. This demand reflected the unity of the national and international objectives of the working people. 'Hands off Soviet Russia' committees were set up in many countries. The Italian movement of solidarity with Soviet Russia demanded: 'Not a gun, not a cartridge, not a single man against the working people's own country!'*** Responding to the calls of the Communist Party of Germany to strengthen the friendly union with Soviet Russia, the German working class went into action with enthusiasm. The dockers on the Kiel Canal took measures to prevent the passage of military transport ships carrying troops and weapons to Russia. 'They want to make you accomplices in the murder of your class

---

the Struggle for Peace, 1917-1924. Documents and Materials), Moscow, 1958, p. 53.

* *Ibid.*, p. 65.

** *Ibid.*, p. 66.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 14.

brothers in Russia,' said a leaflet issued by the Communist Party. French dockers refused to handle interventionist weapons. Pointing out the internationalist nature of the October Revolution, the French Socialist Party told the workers: 'The Russian revolution serves the proletariat of the two hemispheres. Grappling with horrible hardships and making continuous sacrifices, it is fighting for you! The emancipation coming tomorrow will be largely owing to this revolution.'*

Lenin said with reference to the 'Hands off Soviet Russia' movement: 'The international bourgeoisie has only to raise a hand against us to have it seized by its own workers.'**

Vivid proof of proletarian internationalism was also given in those years by internationalists coming from abroad in force to help the Russian working people defeat the interventionists and the White Guards. The spring of 1918 saw the formation of the Red Army International Legion, whose high command addressed an appeal to foreign workers residing in Soviet Russia, which read: 'Russia is in the grip of her enemies. But her voice, louder than the tumult of the world war, is calling mankind to truth and justice for the destitute and the oppressed. Russia has many enemies at home and abroad. They are strong and treacherous. She has no use for empty words or condolences. What she needs is effort, discipline, organisation, and fearless fighters. Do you believe in the revolution and the International? Do you believe in Soviet rule? If you do, join the Red Army International Legion at once.'***

Fighting the interventionists and White Guards side by side with the working people of Soviet Russia and the Red Army were Hungarians, Chinese, Koreans, Germans, Czechs, Serbians, Poles, Romanians and internationalists from other countries. Addressing a meeting of the

---

* *Ibid.*, p. 195.

** V. I. Lenin, 'Speech Delivered at a Congress of Leather Industry Workers, October 2, 1920', *op. cit.*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1977, p. 309.

*** *Boyevoye sodruzhestvo trudyashchikhsya zarubezhnykh stran s narodami Sovetskoi Rossii (1917-1922). Dokumenty i materialy* (Militant Cooperation Between Working People in Foreign Countries and the Peoples of Soviet Russia, 1917-1922. Documents and Materials), Moscow, 1957, p. 569.

Warsaw Revolutionary Regiment on 2 August 1918, Lenin said: 'It is your great privilege to uphold sacred ideas arms in hand, and to make international brotherhood of nations a reality....'*

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

The upsurge of the working-class revolutionary movement under the impact of the October Revolution had promoted the formation of communist parties in many countries. It now became feasible to unite them into a new international organisation. On Lenin's initiative, a Third (Communist) International was founded, which combined Marxism with the international working-class movement. The First (Constituent) Congress of the Communist International (Comintern) convened in Moscow on 2-6 March 1919. The Comintern worked out the general line of the communist movement in the changed historic conditions. It considered the attraction of peasants and oppressed colonial peoples into the revolutionary movement to be of particular importance.

The Communist International played a major role in the dissemination of the ideas of communism, in the establishment of communist parties in colonial and dependent countries, and in strengthening the ties between the national liberation struggle and the revolutionary movement in Europe. The spread of Marxist ideology resulted, in the 1920s, in the emergence of a Communist movement in the East. Among the first Eastern Marxists were Li Ta-chao (China), Ton Duc Thang (Vietnam), and Mustafa Subhi (Turkey). Representatives of Marxist groups in China, Korea, Iran and Turkey were present even at the First Comintern Congress.

The Second Comintern Congress, held in July and August 1920, heard Lenin's detailed report on the national-colonial question. In that speech, as well as in many other works, Lenin formulated a programme that

* V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. 28, p. 40.

could be used by national liberation movements of oppressed peoples in the changed international situation that had developed under the impact of the October Revolution. One of the cornerstones of the programme was the establishment of genuine revolutionary parties in the East, which could lead the people's struggle for national liberation. Lenin was the first, in fact, to strongly recommend the establishment of a united anti-imperialist front and to advance the idea of cooperation of Communists with the revolutionary elements and the bourgeois-democratic forces in the colonies.

Lenin stressed that the international proletariat was the sole ally of the hundreds of millions of toilers and exploited people in the East, and that a close relationship between it and the national liberation movement was indispensable to the success of the world revolutionary process.* He also developed further two major Marxist propositions: first, that the oppressed peoples must be united with the victorious socialist revolution, and second, that they can by-pass the capitalist stage.

Referring to the Bolshevik tactics in Soviet Russia, Lenin said that they alone were internationalist as they did as much as could possibly be done by one country to help and support revolutions throughout the world.

Having overthrown the landlords and capitalists and established the proletariat in power, the October Revolution shattered at one blow the fetters of national oppression and undermined the old national hatreds. It paved the way for cooperation between peoples and earned the Russian proletariat the confidence of its class brothers not only among the nationalities in Russia, but in Europe and Asia as well.

In 1916, Lenin said: 'Now, as always, we stand and shall continue to stand for the closest association and merging of the class-conscious workers of the advanced countries with the workers, peasants and slaves of all the oppressed countries.... We shall exert every effort to foster association and merger with the Mongolians, Persians, Indians,

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, November 22, 1919', *op. cit.*, Vol. 30, Moscow, 1965, p. 162.

Egyptians. We believe it is our duty and *in our interest* to do this, for otherwise socialism in Europe will *not be secure.*'*

The October Revolution began the destruction of the system of exploitation suffered by working people, and spelled the end of national inequality and colonial oppression which was characteristic of imperialism not only in Russia but in the whole world.

After the October Revolution, world social development moved towards an intensification of the struggle of the international working class and the oppressed peoples to rid themselves of the fetters of imperialism, and also towards the national and social emancipation and regeneration of those peoples. This development was immensely influenced by the example of the Soviet state, where the ideas of Marxism-Leninism were being put into practice.

The Soviet state was, as it were, the testing ground for the solution of the national and colonial questions on a world scale, not only because national oppression and inequality was abolished in that country, but also because de facto inequality between nations had been eliminated and their economic and cultural standards had been levelled up. It was a far-reaching scientific forecast which had been borne out in practice in the course of time.

Lenin stressed the international significance of the policy conducted by Soviet Government towards the national regions, which consisted in recognising the absolute equality of the minority peoples and in rendering them fraternal aid. He wrote: 'The attitude of the Soviet Workers' and Peasants' Republic to the weak and hitherto oppressed nations is of very practical significance ... for all the colonies of the world, for thousands and millions of people.'** The October Revolution showed how the proletarians, who had defeated capitalism in an alliance with the peasants, had risen against medieval oppression. Now it was for the young republic to win the awakening peoples of the East over to its side, so that they could fight international imperialism together.

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism', *op. cit.*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

** V. I. Lenin, 'To the Communists of Turkestan', *op. cit.*, Vol. 30, p. 138.

A political task of such international scope naturally could not be performed overnight. Indeed, as events have shown, it takes a considerable time.

Lenin's internationalist approach to the problem of national liberation was a continuation of Marxist theory. At the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, in December 1919, Lenin said: 'The socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism....

'We know that in the East the masses will rise as independent participants, as builders of a new life, because hundreds of millions of the people belong to dependent, underprivileged nations, which until now have been objects of international imperialist policy, and have only existed as material to fertilise capitalist culture and civilisation.'*

In that speech Lenin also noted that the Communists of the East had to apply Marxist theory to local conditions, where peasants made up the bulk of the population, a task which had never been faced by Communists before. The struggle was aimed not so much against the capitalists as against survivals of the Middle Ages and the masses involved were completely new to such activity. Specific forms would have to be evolved in order to ally the progressive proletarians of the whole world and the toiling and exploited masses of the East in their medieval circumstances. Lenin pointed out that one should look for the solution of these problems not only in Marxist theory, but also in the common struggle launched by Soviet Russia. The Eastern countries would have to tackle the task on their own, relying on bourgeois nationalism which was awakening among the people of the East and which has been historically justified. The international pro-

* V. I. Lenin, 'Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East. November 22, 1919', *op. cit.*, Vol. 30, p. 159.

letariat was the sole ally of the working and exploited millions of the East.

A little later, at the Second Congress of the Comintern (1920), Lenin gave a closer definition of the bourgeois-democratic movement in backward countries and of the need for communist parties to support it. He said: 'We have arrived at the unanimous decision to speak of the national-revolutionary movement rather than of the "bourgeois-democratic" movement. It is beyond doubt that any national movement can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement, since the overwhelming mass of the population in the backward countries consists of peasants who represent bourgeois-capitalist relationships. It would be utopian to believe that proletarian parties in these backward countries, if indeed they can emerge in them, can pursue communist tactics and a communist policy, without establishing definite relations with the peasant movement and without giving it effective support.'*

Lenin explained that the imperialist bourgeoisie spared no efforts to spread reformist ideas among the oppressed peoples too, as did a certain section of the indigenous bourgeoisie. The substitution of the words 'national-revolutionary' for 'bourgeois-democratic' means that 'we, as Communists, should and will support bourgeois-liberation movements in the colonies only when they are genuinely revolutionary, and when their exponents do not hinder our work of educating and organising in a revolutionary spirit the peasantry and the masses of the exploited. If these conditions do not exist, the Communists in these countries must combat the reformist bourgeoisie, to whom the heroes of the Second International also belong.'**

Lenin's discovery of the law of the uneven and spasmodic political and economic development of capitalism in the imperialist epoch, and especially his conclusion that a victorious socialist revolution might be performed in one country, lent particular relevance to the concept

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Second Congress of the Communist International', *op. cit.*, Vol. 31, pp. 241-42.

** *Ibid.*, p. 242.

that backward countries can attain socialism without necessarily passing through a capitalist stage.

The concept of the non-capitalist path was formulated by Marx and Engels in the late 1840s and was developed in many of their writings. It was stated with particular clarity in the Foreword to the Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto.*

Lenin developed this concept further, creatively applying Marxism in the changed conditions. In his speech on 20 June 1920, at a sitting of the commission on the national and colonial questions of the Second Comintern Congress, Lenin said that the capitalist stage was not obligatory for backward peoples in ridding themselves of national oppression. If the victorious revolutionary proletariat conducted systematic propaganda among them, and the Soviet state helped them as much as it could, they would be able to by-pass the capitalist stage.

This concept overturned the Second International's opportunist idea that the backward countries could not possibly avoid the capitalist stage; its scientific validity and viability have been confirmed by the development of all the Union and Autonomous Republics, regions and national areas of the Soviet Union. Many republics, regions and areas with a total population of more than 35 million made the transition to socialism from feudalism (or even earlier forms of society) or from rudimentary capitalism. Consider, for example, the Soviet Central Asian Republics, and the Autonomous republics, regions and national areas in the extreme East, South and North of the USSR.

This prediction was also realised in the Mongolian People's Republic and the People's Republic of Tannu Tuva which have gone from early pastoral feudalism to socialism, by-passing capitalism. From the accounts given by Mongolian revolutionaries of a meeting between Lenin and Sukhe Bator (one of the leaders of the Provisional People's Government of Mongolia) and other members of a Mongolian delegation, in November 1921, we can see Lenin's opinion of the advances made by the Mongolian people. Lenin said that the rate at which the Mongolian revolution was developing appeared to be more rapid than that of the 'great' European revolutions. Over a mere

period of months the Mongolians, following the lead of the proletarian revolution in Russia, had accomplished what had taken hundreds of years in other countries. During the conversation Lenin answered some questions on the fundamental problems of the Mongolian revolution and the non-capitalist development of Mongolia.

The first question asked by the Mongolian delegation was: 'Comrade Lenin, what do you think about the establishment of a People's Revolutionary Party in our country and what is most important for us?' Lenin replied that the only right way for every working person in their country was to fight for state and economic independence in alliance with the workers and peasants of Soviet Russia. This fight could not be carried on in isolation, therefore the establishment of a party of Mongolian arats was a pledge of success in their struggle.

Replying to the second question, 'Will the national liberation struggle be victorious?', Lenin said: 'Although Mongolia is a cattle-breeding country and the bulk of her population are nomad herdsmen, she has achieved great progress in her revolution, and, most important of all, has made good these successes by creating a People's Revolutionary Party of her own, whose aim is to become a mass party uncluttered by alien elements.'

Replying to the question of whether the People's Revolutionary Party ought to be transformed into a communist party, Lenin said: 'I should not recommend it, because one party cannot be "transformed" into another.' Having explained that the communist party was essentially a party of the proletariat, Lenin said: 'The revolutionaries will have to put in a good deal of work in developing state, economic and cultural activities before the herdsman elements become a proletarian mass, which may eventually help to "transform" the people's Revolutionary Party into a communist party. A mere change of signboards is harmful and dangerous.'*

Lenin believed that in order to make it possible for Mongolia to embark on non-capitalist development it would be essential for its People's Revolutionary Party and

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Talk with a Delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic', *op. cit.*, Vol. 42, Moscow, 1977, p. 361.

its government to step up their efforts, so that cooperatives would multiply, new forms of economic management and national culture take root, and the peasants rally round the Party and the government.

According to B. Tserendorj, a delegation member, Lenin said this about Soviet Russia's policy towards Mongolia and the further development of Soviet-Mongolian relations: 'Our Russian state has been helping Mongolia until now and will go on helping you in all your cultural undertakings. And in giving aid we, unlike the autocratic Russia of old, seek neither profit, power nor the use of your natural resources, but pursue, above all, the goal of emancipation of all small and backward nationalities and the masses oppressed and exploited by the imperialists and the bourgeoisie throughout the world. Because of this we cancel altogether the unequal treaties that were imposed by force on Mongolia by the old Russian autocratic government, and conclude a new treaty which is equal and equally advantageous to both parties. In future, too, we, Russia and Mongolia, must act, as neighbour states in our policy and, as an elder and a younger brother in our friendly relations.'*

The Soviet Government firmly renounced tsarism's colonialist policy in foreign relations. Peace and equality of all countries, big or small, non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations, the right of every oppressed nation to build its state freely—such were the truly democratic foreign policy principles of the Soviet Republic.

In 1919 the Soviet Government was the first to recognise the independence of Afghanistan. Lenin personally received the Afghan plenipotentiaries twice and discussed a wide range of matters concerning relations between the RSFSR and Afghanistan with them. The two countries concluded a Treaty of Friendship on 28 February 1921. One can form an idea of the sincere and favourable attitude of the RSFSR towards this feudal country from looking at the instructions sent by the RSFSR People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs to the Russian ambassador in Afghanistan on 3 June 1921. This

* *Sovremennaya Mongolia* (Mongolia Today), No. 5-6, 1957, p. 24.

document reads: 'Our policy is a policy of peace and cooperation between all peoples. Given that the peoples of the East, being economically backward, are painfully sensitive to foreign economic oppression, socialist Soviet Russia is their natural friend. Our policy in the East is not aggressive, but a policy of peace and friendship. You must systematically underline this key point in everything you do. Your main objective in Kabul is to promote our friendship with Afghanistan. Friendship implies mutual assistance, and, as we wish to do all we can to further the progress and prosperity of a friendly Afghanistan, we are prepared to give her as much assistance as we can in that peaceful endeavour. You should acquaint yourself thoroughly with Afganistan's needs and requirements and the wishes of her government, so that we should be able, in pursuance of the Russo-Afghan Treaty, to aid her as much as we can in order to contribute to her progress and well-being. You are to pay most particular attention to the Emir's programme of reform. In its present circumstances, the enlightened absolute monarchy of an eighteenth-century European type is a genuinely progressive phenomenon in Afghanistan. We have no reason, nor do we need, to apply the same yardstick to Afghanistan as we apply to economically developed countries. Naturally we should not forget or ignore the glaring contrast between the programme of communism and the programme undertaken by the present Afghan government. We must not conceal our true nature. Still, this does not prevent us from expressing our sympathy with, and supporting in every way, the reforms of the friendly Afghan government, and the progressive experiments of enlightened absolutism in Afghanistan. This does not make us monarchists or supporters of absolutism. That must be made absolutely clear. But we are willing to do what we can to assist the progressive-minded Emir in his attempts at reform.

'You must carefully avoid the fatal error of trying to implant communism artificially in the country. We say to the Afghan government: "We have one political system and you have another; our ideals are of one kind, and yours are of a different kind; we are, nevertheless, linked by the same desire for the absolute self-reliance, indepen-

dence and initiative of our peoples. We do not interfere in your home affairs nor do we intrude upon your people's initiative. We actively support every move that may promote the progress of your people. We do not intend to foist on your people any programme foreign to it at its present stage of development."'*

The establishment of the Soviet state laid the foundation of new relations between Russia and Iran. The Soviet Government cancelled the inequitable tsarist treaties with Iran and renounced the privileges and concessions the tsarist government and Russian monopolies had enjoyed there. The Russian-owned discount-and-loan bank, the Enzeli-Tehran highway, the Dzhulfa-Tabriz railway, and the port of Enzeli were unconditionally returned to Iran. On 26 February 1921 a treaty was signed in Moscow between the Soviet Republic and Iran. It was the first treaty concluded between Iran and a great power on equal terms.

Equality and a respect for sovereignty were at the basis of the relations between the Soviet Republic and Turkey. Towards the end of World War I Turkey found itself, in fact, under the heel of the Entente powers. The Soviet Government resolutely defended Turkey's sovereignty and independence. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, President of Turkey, sent Lenin a telegram on 19 December 1920 thanking him for the far-sighted Soviet foreign policy which he had initiated.**

On 16 March 1921 a Treaty of Friendship was concluded between the RSFSR and Turkey. It contained fundamental propositions on the relationship between the national liberation movements of the Eastern peoples and the new social system established through revolution by the working people of Russia. The contracting parties recognised the Eastern peoples' right to freedom and independence, as well as their right to choose a form of government in accordance with their wishes.*** On 13 October in Kars, a Treaty of Friendship was signed between Turkey and the Transcaucasian Soviet Republics

* *Dokumenty vneshnei politiki SSSR* (Soviet Foreign Policy Documents), Vol. IV, Moscow, 1960, pp. 166-67.

** *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 451.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 599.

of Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan. On 2 January 1922, when a special mission led by M. V. Frunze was in Ankara, a Treaty of Friendship was signed between Turkey and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The success of the October Revolution inspired the masses in China to fight their oppressors with even greater determination. The revolutionary forces in China welcomed the October Revolution and successfully employed the experience of the Russian proletariat and its Party in its own struggle for social and national emancipation. The truth is, however, that while the Soviet Government expressed from the start its firm determination to establish friendly relations with China, the feudal-capitalist Peking government, under the pressure of the imperialist powers and Chinese militarists, took an openly anti-Soviet stand. Chinese military cliques took part in armed intervention in the young Soviet state and even sent troops to Russia.

The principles of Leninist foreign policy towards China were stated in the Appeal of the Council of People's Commissars to the Chinese people and the governments of South and North China, issued on 25 July 1919. The Appeal said in part: 'We bring to peoples freedom from the yoke imposed by foreign bayonets and foreign gold which keeps a stranglehold on the oppressed peoples of the East, and of China above all. We bring help not only to our own labouring classes, but also to the Chinese people....'* The Soviet Government recalled that it had renounced all treaties imposed on China by the tsarist government, which stipulated Russia's 'right' to certain spheres of influence, concessions and settlements.

The victory won by the working people of Soviet Russia in the civil war and the growing revolutionary movement in China itself made it increasingly difficult for the reactionary militarist groups to ignore Soviet proposals for the normalisation of relations between the two countries. Nonetheless, the Peking Government was at that time a puppet of world imperialism and delayed normalisation with the USSR. It took four more years of joint efforts by

---

* *Dokumenty vneshnei politiki SSSR* (Soviet Foreign Policy Documents), Vol. II, Moscow, 1958, p. 221.

the Soviet and Chinese peoples before friendly relations were established.

In May 1924 an agreement was concluded on the general principles for the regulation of questions between the USSR and the Chinese Republic, whereby the Soviet Government renounced the unfair secret treaties imposed on China by the tsarist government.*

While nullifying the inequitable treaties concluded by tsarist Russia with Eastern countries and repudiating the onerous obligations imposed by the Western imperialists on the peoples of Russia, the Soviet Government simultaneously emphasised the validity of earlier treaties and agreements, which regulated normal relations and trade with other countries and also confirmed the historically established Soviet state borders.

The young Soviet state was in a bad economic position after the world war and civil war, but nevertheless tried to aid those peoples which had embarked on independent development. G. V. Chicherin, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the RSFSR, observed: 'During the historical period which has just started and which may last longer than we know, we can do a lot to support the Eastern countries struggling to escape being economically swallowed up by the Entente powers. It will give great scope to our own economic activities and will make circumstances especially favourable for the development of the workers' and peasants' movements in the Eastern countries, which will thus be in contact with Russia and her proletarian government.'**

The principle of giving economic aid to Eastern peoples is prominent in many Soviet foreign policy documents. G. V. Chicherin wrote to the Soviet Ambassador in Iran on 9 January 1922: 'Our Eastern policy remains diametri-

---

* It is worth noting that the treaties determining the state boundary between Russia and China were not referred to by the agreement as inequitable or secret. The provisions on territorial issues made in these treaties as well as in protocols, maps and descriptions, are fully in force now as before. The present Sino-Soviet border in the Far East was established many generations ago, and follows the natural topographical features separating the territory of the USSR and China.

** *Leninskaya vneshnaya politika Sovetskoi strany, 1917-1924* (Leninist Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia, 1917-1924), Moscow, 1969, p. 58.

cally opposed to that of the imperialist countries. Our Eastern policy is aimed at the independent economic and political development of Eastern peoples, and we will give them every support in this. As we see it, our role and mission is to be the natural and disinterested friends and allies of those peoples who are trying to attain full and independent economic and political development.'

Reminiscences and other writings of noted political figures have a great deal to say about the immense impact of the October Revolution on the development of Eastern countries. 'Look at Soviet Russia,' said Sun Yat-sen, the great Chinese revolutionary democrat, in 1923. 'Its army was encircled, but the Communist Party, in contrast to all the counter-revolutionary governments—Kolchak's, Denikin's and so on—had its own revolutionary government round which the people rallied, and it won... We live in an explosive age, and we must learn from the lessons of history. As for the results of the Russian revolution, they are obvious to everyone, and we must take example from it....'

In 1925, shortly before his death, Sun Yat-sen had a message sent to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union. It ran: 'Dear comrades, as I lie here in sickness, against which man is helpless, my thoughts turn to you and to the destinies of my Party and my country. You lead a union of free republics, a palpable legacy left to the oppressed peoples of the world by the immortal Lenin. Using this legacy, the victims of imperialism are sure to achieve freedom and emancipation from the international system that has deep roots in slavery, war and injustice. I leave behind me the Party, which, as I have always hoped, will be linked with you in the historic task of ultimately liberating not only China but also other exploited countries from this imperialist system....

'With this object in mind, I have instructed the Party to maintain constant contact with you. I firmly believe in the unremitting support you have given my country up to now.

'Taking my leave of you, dear comrades, I should like to express the hope that the day may come soon when the USSR can greet a mighty and free China as a friend and ally, and that, in the great struggle for the liberation of

the oppressed peoples of the world, the two allies shall march to victory hand in hand.'*

Jawaharlal Nehru, the eminent Indian statesman, wrote: 'A study of Marx and Lenin produced a powerful effect on my mind and helped me to see history and current affairs in a new light. The long chain of history and of social development appeared to have some meaning, some sequence, and the future lost some of its obscurity. The practical achievements of the Soviet Union were also tremendously impressive.... The Soviet revolution had advanced human society by a great leap and had lit a bright flame which could not be smothered, and ... it had laid the foundations for that "new civilization" toward which the world would advance.'**

The 1917 October Revolution in Russia helped progressive elements in colonial and dependent countries to work out their own programmes to attain the national and social emancipation of their countries. It gave an impetus to the national liberation struggle in the colonies, which caused a grave crisis in the imperialist colonial system. As early as 1919 and 1920, the peoples of Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran scored major victories over the colonisers. The scope of the anti-imperialist movement in South and South-East Asia and the Arab countries greatly increased.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SOVIET UNION, THE BIRTHPLACE OF SOCIALIST NATIONS AND NATIONALITIES

With the transition to peaceful construction, it became extremely important to unify the efforts of the Soviet Republics on a national scale, to cope with economic dislocation, to restore and develop the economy, to raise living standards, and to build up the country's defences.

After the civil war, the idea that the Soviet Republics should be brought together into one state increasingly took hold of the working class and the people, who

---

* *Pravda*, 14 March 1925.

** Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, John Day Co., N. Y., 1946, p. 17.

realised that the fraternal republics, encircled by the capitalist countries, could hold out against them and build socialism only if they were welded into a political union.

The political consolidation of the Soviet nations and nationalities was objectively promoted by the essentially internationalist class nature of Soviet power, which rests on the social ownership of the means of production and rules out exploitation.

The need for unification was clear to the working people in every Soviet republic. The Soviet peoples, who were united by their common effort to establish and fortify the dictatorship of the proletariat and to build socialism, also strove for political unification in order to defend the gains of the October Revolution.

All economic resources had to be pooled in order to utilise them more efficiently in the fight against economic dislocation. The division of labour between different parts of Russia and the single transportation system made economic unification of the Soviet Republics easier. Coal and oil traditionally came from the South; iron and steel from the Donets Basin and the Urals; cotton from Central Asia; machinery, metal goods and textiles from Central Russia; timber from Siberia, and so on. The international situation also made consolidation desirable, as it was necessary to provide for the country's defences against the threat of attack and to have a single strong Red Army, to counter attempts at foreign economic blockade, to unite the efforts of the republics to obtain diplomatic recognition for the Soviet state and to develop normal relations with other countries.

There was heated discussion of the concrete methods by which a unified multinational state should be formed. In the autumn of 1922 a widespread movement for unification developed in every republic. It was suggested that the Soviet Republics should be unified on an autonomous basis, and join the RSFSR as autonomous republics. Lenin and the Communist Party rejected the idea, explaining that it would infringe upon the rights of the sovereign republics and would not result in the establishment of a single union state, which could best be achieved if the republics were of equal status. Lenin emphasised that in uniting the republics it was essential 'not to destroy

their *independence*, but to create another *new storey*, a federation of *equal* republics'*.

Lenin elaborated a plan for the formation of a single Soviet union state as a voluntary union of equal republics. His initiative was supported by a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the RCP (Bolsheviks) held on 6 October 1922, which resolved that a treaty should be concluded between the Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Transcaucasian Federation and the RSFSR, to join them into a single state, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Lenin's idea was supported by the broad mass of the people as well as by the congresses of Soviets, held in the larger Soviet republics, that is, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, the RSFSR and the Transcaucasian Federation.**

On 30 December 1922, the First All-Union Congress of Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Red Army Deputies signied a historic document, the Declaration and Treaty on the formation of a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was a triumph for the Leninist ideas of proletarian, socialist internationalism, of fraternal friendship and the unity of the equal and sovereign peoples of the socialist state. Noting the universal significance of the establishment of the Soviet Union, the Chairman of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee (VTsIK), Mikhail Kalinin, told the Congress of Soviets: 'First of all, this unifying congress enables us to strengthen our material resources to hold our own against the bourgeois world which is hostile to us. Second, the political unification of the Soviet Republics enormously enhances their real significance vis-à-vis the entire bourgeois world. And,

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'On the Establishment of the USSR', *op. cit.*, Vol. 42, p. 422.

** The Transcaucasian Federation was formed in 1922 on the initiative of Lenin, the Communist Parties, and the toiling masses of Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia, giving a political form to the 'friendly coexistence of the Transcaucasian peoples, a form that will breed peace and affection among these peoples and assure their economic regeneration' (G. K. Ordjonikidze, *Statyi i rechi* [Articles and Speeches], Vol. I, p. 266). The Federation was important in overcoming inter-national conflicts incited by Georgian Mensheviks, Azerbaijanian Mussavatists, Armenian Dashnaks and other nationalists in Transcaucasia, and in bringing the peoples together in order to build socialism.

third, we are here laying the first stone of a truly fraternal society.'*

The first to join the USSR were the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and the Transcaucasian Federation. They were followed by Uzbekistan and Turkmenia, which had been members of the RSFSR till 1924 and 1925 respectively, then by Tajikistan, part of Uzbekistan till 1929, and later by Kirghizia and Kazakhstan, which had been in the RSFSR till 1936. In 1936, the Transcaucasian Federation was dissolved and the Azerbaijanian, Georgian and Armenian Union Soviet Socialist Republics were established. In 1940 the USSR was joined by Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Moldavia, and the Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Moldavian peoples were reunified.

The form of political unification adopted made it possible to make allowance for the specific features of the development of the peoples involved. The Soviet Government framed its policy so as to make it clearly comprehensible and acceptable to the advanced and backward peoples alike. The Leninist Party educated the working class and people of the Soviet state in such a spirit that the interests of each people harmonised with those of all the other peoples, and international objectives were given priority over purely local objectives.

The Party instructed the Communists working among the backward nationalities to give every support and assistance to the activities of the leading local elements, avoiding anything that could be interpreted as an attempt to run things in the name of the central government. They were ordered to trust local revolutionary-democratic elements and, in general, all those who were loyal to the Soviet Government. Special attention was paid to winning over the native intelligentsia.

With the establishment of the USSR conditions became favourable for the development of national statehood. The convergence of nations on internationalist principles made it possible for the Soviet federation to be further improved: thirteen Autonomous regions became Autonomous republics, and six Autonomous Soviet Socialist

---

* M. I. Kalinin, *Voprosy sovetskogo stroitelstva* (Problems of Soviet Development), Moscow, 1958, pp. 144-45.

republics became Union republics. In 1923 there were 33 ethnic territorial units, which meant that many nationalities in the USSR, regardless of size, had their own governmental bodies.

Soviet Russia became the most multinational country in the world. It was inhabited by altogether more than a hundred different peoples and ethnic groups. Most of them were settled in compact ethnic bodies (the Ukrainians, the Byelorussians, the Uzbeks, the Tatars, the Kazakhs, the Azerbaijanians, the Armenians, the Georgians, the Tajiks, the Turkmens, the Kirghizes, the peoples of Daghestan, the Mordvinians, and others), while some formed small scattered communities or were completely dispersed. More than half of the population of the country (53 per cent) were Russian (77.8 million). Lenin noted even before the revolution that the presence in Russia of Slav nations with similar language, history and culture, and similar traditions in their fight for national liberation would be significant in the building of a new society. Next in number to the Russians were the other Slav nations: the Ukrainians—31.2 million (21 per cent of the total Soviet population) and the Byelorussians—4.74 million (3 per cent).

Below are figures on the ethnic composition of the population of the Soviet Union according to the 1926 census, as compared with the 1970 census.

Below are figures on the ethnic composition of the population of the Soviet Union according to the 1926 census, compared with the 1970 census.

(thousands of persons)

	1926	1970
Total population	147,029	241,720
Russians	77,791	129,015
Ukrainians	31,195	40,753
Uzbeks	3,989	9,195
Byelorussians	4,739	9,052
Tatars	3,311	5,931
Kazakhs	3,968	5,299
Azerbaijanians	1,713	4,380
Armenians	1,568	3,559
Georgians	1,821	3,245

	1926	1970
Moldavians	279	2,698
Lithuanians	41	2,665
Jews	2,672	2,151
Tajiks	981	2,136
Chuvashi	1,117	1,694
Turkmens	764	1,525
Kirghizes	763	1,452
Latvians	151	1,430
Peoples of Daghestan	698	1,365
of which:		
Avars	197	396
Lesghins	135	324
Dargins	126	231
Kumyks	95	189
Laks	40	86
Tabasaran	32	55
Nogais	36	52
Rutul	10	12
Tsakhur	19	11
Agul	7.7	8.8
Mordvinians	1,340	1,263
Bashkirs	714	1,240
Estonians	155	1,007
Udmurts	514	704
Chechens	319	613
Mari	428	599
Ossets	272	488
Komi and Komi-Permyaks	376	475
of which:		
Komi	226	322
Komi-Permyaks	150	153
Buryats	238	315
Yakuts	241	296
Kabardinians	140	280
Karakalpaks	146	236
Ingushes	74	158
Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East	130	151
of which:		
Nentsi	18	29
Evenks	39	25
Khanty	22	21
Chukchi	13	14
Evens	2	12

	1926	1970
Nanaians	5.9	10
Mansi	5.8	7.7
Koryaks	7.4	7.5
Dolgans	0.7	4.9
Nivkhi	4.1	4.4
Selkups	1.6	4.3
Ulchi	0.7	2.4
Saami	1.7	1.9
Udeghe	1.4	1.5
Itelmens	4.2	1.3
Kets	1.4	1.2
Orochi	0.6	1.1
Nganasans	...	1.0
Yukaghirs	0.4	0.6
Karelians	248	146
Adygei and Circassians, *of which:*	65	140
Adygei	...	100
Circassians	...	40
Tuvinians	02	139
Kalmyks	132	137
Karachays	55	113
Abkhazians	57	83
Khakassians	46	67
Balkars	33	60
Altaians	52	56
Others	3,692	5,409

The Leninist principle of the indissoluble unity of Union and national-republican statehood was embodied in the very structure of the government bodies and organs of administration. It was decided that the highest body of state authority of the Soviet Union (the Central Executive Committee—CEC) should consist of two chambers, that is, the Soviet of the Union, elected by the whole country on the basis of proportional representation, and the Soviet of Nationalities, elected by all Union and Autonomous republics, national regions and areas. Both chambers have an equal right to initiate laws and to exercise their legislative functions. It is worth noting that Russians

accounted for 56 per cent of the Soviet of the Union and for 13 per cent of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Third CEC (May 1925).

In shaping the state system in the national republics, considerable attention was paid to local traditions. Thus, in setting up Soviets in the Far North and Far East, note was taken of the tribal principle, among other things. The government bodies of the peoples of the North (Nentsi, Evenks, Chukchi, and so on) included clan meetings, clan Soviets, district native congresses, and district native executive committees. Each clan elected its tribal Soviet, composed of a chairman, a vice-chairman, and a Soviet member. This was not in order to introduce socialism on a clan basis; it showed concern for the particular economic and political conditions prevailing among those small Northern peoples. Wherever national minorities lived in compact groups, national regions and areas were formed and ethnic village Soviets were set up. In 1931, when some experience had been amassed and local personnel trained, the clan Soviets were abolished by a resolution of the Presidium of the All-Union Central Executive Committee.

The peoples of the North went over from patriarchal self-government to a socialist state organisation, by-passing all the intermediate stages of political development. Thus their state organisation emerged not as a result of social antagonisms, not as a means for exploiters to oppress the working people, it was socialist from its very outset. Its main purpose was not to suppress the exploiting element—which had not had time to develop—but to involve the people in building socialism and to fundamentally refashion their underdeveloped social relations, economy, culture and daily life.

The new society was constructed in diverse ways in the different Union and Autonomous republics and national regions of the USSR, as they were at different levels of economic development. Consideration was always paid to local features; for example, in the early years of Soviet Government, it was necessary, above all, to eliminate the consequences of tsarist colonial policy in the ethnic borderlands of Soviet Russia, to stamp out all remaining manifestations of national inequality and unite the Rus-

sian working people and the working people of other nationalities with the formerly oppressed and underdeveloped peoples, on the basis of voluntary cooperation. The wrongs inflicted by the tsarist government on the peoples in the ethnic borderlands were rectified. State reserve land and that previously owned by rich Russian colonists or joint-stock companies in Central Asia, Kazakhstan and the Caucasus was distributed among the local peasants, while some colonists were resettled in Central Russia.

In places where communal ownership still prevailed or the classes had not yet differentiated sufficiently (as in the Far North, Kazakhstan, etc.), Lenin instructed that the nationalisation of land and other sweeping social and economic reforms should be postponed for some time.

The organisation of agricultural and producers' cooperatives in the national republics had specific features. In view of Lenin's precepts on the importance of local conditions and the customs of even the smallest peoples in the ethnic borderlands, the Communist Party did its best to help preserve and develop the traditional local patterns of collective work, encouraging traditional forms of mutual assistance at work, such as communal grazing and cattle-breeding in Kazakhstan, Kirghizia and Karakalpakia, collective construction and maintenance of irrigation systems in Uzbekistan and Turkmenia, and collective gathering of wild foods.

The first cooperatives in Central Asia, for example, were usually formed from traditional economic collectives, each specialising in a particular kind of production. The long-standing tradition of communal property facilitated the joint exploitation and subsequent socialisation of those resources in the collective farms.

Though the key to the solution of the national question was found, this did not mean that the matter had been resolved completely and finally. In order to carry out the national programme it was necessary to abolish the legacy of the past, that is, the economic and cultural inequality of the peoples of Russia.

The Communist Party and the Soviet state were particularly concerned with this issue. The programme worked out by the Party to counter the backwardness of

the ethnic borderlands gave absolute priority to the principle of giving all necessary assistance to those small nations which had formerly been oppressed by more advanced and larger peoples; it was a complex of social, economic, political, and cultural measures. Factories in Central Russia and the Urals produced machinery to construct factories in the underdeveloped areas, unstintingly sharing their production experience and helping to train local engineering personnel.

By decree of the Soviet Central Executive Committee a special fund to aid the backward peoples was set aside in the State Budget in 1926. In 1926 the CEC also agreed to give aid to enable Kirghiz and Kazakh nomads adopt a settled way of life, and to exempt the peoples of the Far North from taxes.

Redistribution of the state national income in favour of the ethnic borderlands played a determining role in their economic development. These areas received large subsidies from the State Budget, amounting, for example, to roughly 92.2 per cent of Tajikistan's budget in 1927, and 80 per cent of Kazakhstan's in 1931 to 1934. Between 1928 and 1933 more than 2.5 thousand million roubles were set aside for the economic and cultural development of the Central Asian Republics.

In the course of socialist industrialisation major social and economic shifts occurred in the distribution of productive forces; the factories were brought closer to the sources of raw material; thousands of modern factories and mills were built, and new centres of industry were established in Byelorussia, the Ukraine, the North Caucasus, Transcaucasia, Central Asia, Kazakhstan, Tataria, Bashkiria, the Urals, East and West Siberia, the Far East, and elsewhere.

Experienced Communists, skilled workers, engineers, agronomists, economic experts, and cultural workers were sent from the country's working-class centres to work permanently in the national republics and territories, assisting and advising local personnel. Some industrial concerns—such as textile mills and tanneries—were moved to Central Asia and Transcaucasia.

The formation of the local working class was of great political significance. In Kazakhstan, for example, it

developed around major industrial concerns and railways (the Emba Oilfields, the Trans-Siberian Railway, and so on), and in the Chuvash ASSR around new building projects at which local people were apprenticed to workers specially sent there from Central Russia. Large-scale factory training programmes were launched and many local workers were trained individually at factories in the central districts of the RSFSR.

The next task of major importance was to create Soviet, party and economic machinery, and to organise the entire life of society on the basis of the indigenous languages, without which the bulk of the people could not possibly be drawn into the building of a new society. In view of the prevailing illiteracy, the use of the indigenous language in government, in the media, in schools, in the establishment and development of native literature and art, resulted in the extension of the scope of the socialist revolution. People who worked in the national republics knew the indigenous language, were familiar with the habits and customs of the native people and were sensitive to their needs. In the republics and territories inhabited mostly by Moslems, mosques were taken under state protection, while religious courts continued to function alongside the state courts for a number of years.

Intensive training of local personnel went on in all the Soviet Republics. Much was done to promote and perfect a culture that was national in form and socialist in content. The press, the arts, club activities and general cultural and educational work were developed. Most of the population of the ethnic districts and borderlands was illiterate. According to the 1926 census, in the 9-49 age groups, literates comprised merely 3.7, 15.1, and 10.6 per cent of the population in Tajikistan, Kirghizia and Uzbekistan respectively. For this reason, both general education and vocational training programmes and schools were inaugurated on a large scale in the national republics, to train local personnel, primarily workers and school-teachers, intensively. A notable contribution to the training of local executives for the Central Asian Republics and for the peoples of the North was made respectively by the Communist University of the Working

People of the East and by a special department opened at Leningrad State University.

Writing systems in about 50 native languages were worked out for the first time. Before the revolution even such sizable peoples as the Uzbek, the Tajik, the Kirghiz and the Kazakh had hardly any literature of their own nor had they anything like an adequate number of schools giving instruction in the native language. Most of the books published were on religious themes. This situation was radically altered under Soviet rule.

In 1927 it was decided to provide a Romanised alphabet for the Turkic peoples to replace the Arabic system and thus make it easier for them to overcome their cultural lag and advance into socialist development. The Central Asian peoples eventually adopted the Russian alphabet. Printed matter in the local languages was now issued in quantity. Since the government bodies and schools used the native language, it was easier to draw the bulk of the people, most of whom were illiterate or semi-literate, into the building of socialism.

The Increase in Literacy

(in per cent)

Republic	1926	1939
RSFSR	55	81.9
Ukraine	57.5	85.3
Byelorussia	53.1	78.9
Azerbaijan	25.2	73.3
Georgia	47.5	80.3
Armenia	34.5	73.8
Turkmenia	12.5	67.2
Uzbekistan	10.6	67.8
Tajikistan	3.7	71.7
Kazakhstan	22.8	76.3
Kirghizia	15.1	70

The table shows that by 1939 the standard of literacy in the once backward republics of Central Asia and Transcaucasia approximated that obtaining in the central parts of the USSR. This advance was facilitated by large allocations made from the State Budget for public education in these republics. As the level of education

increased in the thirties, Russian began to spread as the language of inter-national intercourse.

Changes in the economic and social structure and cultural development of Soviet society were an indication of the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union. In November 1936 the Extraordinary Eighth All-Union Congress of Soviets adopted a new Soviet Constitution.* The Constitution reflected the profound changes Soviet society had undergone between 1924 and 1936. The exploitation of man by man had been stamped out forever. Public, socialist ownership of the means of production was firmly established as the unshakable foundation of socialism. The class structure of society was radically changed: all the exploiting classes had been abolished. The proletariat was now free from exploitation and had become the leading force of society. One of the most fundamental aspects of this change was the strengthening of the leading role of the working class, and its close alliance with the toiling peasantry, which had gone over from individual small farming to large-scale collective socialist farming.

The intellectuals were recruited mainly from among workers and peasants. The peoples of the USSR had changed; their erstwhile suspicion of each other had disappeared, giving way to friendship and fraternal cooperation within the framework of an integrated union state.

The triumph of socialism gave rise to moral and political unity within Soviet society, which was now free from all national and social oppression. On the basis of the socialist mode of production the Soviet peoples developed and shared many highly humanitarian features and traditions: a new world outlook, a socialist attitude to work and public property, a gradual erasing of the differences between town and country and a greater unity of spirit between them, the raising of the cultural and technical level of workers and peasants, the development of prerequisites for the eventual elimination of the difference between mental and manual labour, and so on.

---

* The Constitution of the RSFSR was adopted in 1918. The Constitutions of the USSR were adopted in 1924, 1936 and 1977.

The history of the USSR has opened two roads to the formation of socialist nations. One is the radical transformation of bourgeois into socialist nations, as happened, for example, in Russia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Armenia, Georgia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The other is the formation of socialist nations from pre-bourgeois ethnic communities or nationalities which had not reached capitalism by the time of the revolution and passed to socialism without having gone through the capitalist stage. That was the way in which, for example, the Uzbek, Kazakh, Tajik, Turkmen, Kirghiz socialist nations were formed.

This does not, of course, imply the disappearance of nations or nationalities, or the abolition of their national distinctiveness.

The unique national features of each socialist nation and nationality are vividly seen in the republics and national regions of the USSR. The Communist Party has always taken these distinctive features into consideration, and it continues to do so, remembering Lenin's postulate that national differences will exist longer than class differences. The Soviet socialist nations and nationalities carefully assimilated and developed on a new social foundation all that was democratic and progressive in their own history and that of all other Soviet peoples. Profound respect for the progressive features of the culture of the past and the utilisation of those features to further patriotic education and Soviet culture are fundamental to Soviet national policy.

This may give rise to some questions. Was the building of socialism and the socialist transformation of nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union an automatic, inevitable process with pre-ordained results? Could victory have been assured in October 1917, in the Civil War, in the rehabilitation period, the prewar five-year plan periods, and subsequently, if there had not been an organised and politically mature working class and a Leninist Party with a correct political line and leadership?

Without the Leninist Party, without its accurate leadership and organising influence on the masses, the October Revolution, the building of socialism, the upsurge and

flourishing of the world's first socialist state would have been impossible.

The Soviet Union is a living embodiment of socialist internationalism, of the unshakable, voluntary, and fraternal unity of socialist nations, of their absolute mutual trust and cooperation.

This means that under socialism the national issue cannot merely be reduced to a question of international relations, however important that may be. Immense significance also attaches to the internationalist essence of the socialist nations and nationalities, ensuing from the abolition of exploitation and the establishment of fundamentally new relations between people within each nation and nationality. Since they are definite historico-social and economic communities, nations and nationalities function not only in the sphere of economic relations but also in the sphere of political, ideological, cultural, domestic and foreign relations.

The formation and development of socialist nations in the USSR has completely overturned the bourgeois-nationalist concepts which maintain that nations are communities which have existed since the earliest times, possess particular 'supra-class' objective regularities and rest on 'blood kinship', 'racial superiority', 'biological soundness', and so on. The experience of the USSR and also—after World War Two—of the other fraternal socialist countries has shown both in theory and practice that nations are developing historico-economic communities, and that the character of the given socio-economic formation determines the definition of the essence of a nation. A nation is, therefore, characterised by corresponding economic, social, political, ideological and ethnic factors in a dialectical unity. However, social, class factors play the determining role.

It was much to the credit of the Leninist Communist Party that it never viewed any task connected with the building of socialism in the USSR separately from the general aims of the world revolutionary process. On the basis of the socialist mode of production all nations and nationalities in the USSR acquired and developed common, highly humanitarian features and traditions. The Party's skill in correctly combining the approach to both

current and long-term problems, and international as well as patriotic duties, helped to develop in the Soviet people qualities which distinguish them from members of bourgeois society. It has long been noted that Russians, Ukrainians, Armenians and other Soviet people have much more in common, in terms of their views and habits, with Soviet people of any nationality, than they have with Russian, Ukrainian, Armenian or other emigres brought up and residing in bourgeois countries.

In the process of transition from capitalism to socialism and during the abolition of exploitation nations undergo most profound change. The socio-economic character of a nation is different: in place of the bourgeois mode of production with its characteristic class antagonisms, the socialist mode of production, involving the moral and political unity of all working members of society, which is inherent in the socialist system, becomes firmly established.

The leading force of the nation is no longer the bourgeoisie, but the working class. Ideology and culture change accordingly: a single socialist, internationalist ideology and single culture, to which exploitation, nationalism and chauvinism are alien, replace the dual ideology and culture (that of the exploited and that of exploiting classes) inherent in the pre-capitalist ethnic communities and the capitalist nations.

The inherent tendency of the socialist nations to draw together and cooperate with other fraternal nations comes into action, and there is an increased keenness to master Russian as the language of inter-national intercourse, which facilitates political, scientific, technological and other relationships between the fraternal nations.

The Russian people and its working class have played a historic role in the building of socialism and the firm establishment in the USSR of a new way of life and internationalist ideology. Leonid Brezhnev observed: 'All the nations and nationalities of our country, above all, the great Russian people, played their role in the formation, consolidation and development of this mighty union of equal nations that have taken the road to socialism. The revolutionary energy, dedication, diligence and profound internationalism of the Russian people have quite legiti-

mately won them the sincere respect of all the other peoples of our socialist motherland.'* The Russian working class and people bore the brunt of the revolution, the wars, and the building of socialism. The revolution and the building of socialism advanced from among the Russian working class and people many thousands of gifted leaders of the Soviet state and people, organisers of our large-scale socialist economy, scientists and cultural figures, noted military figures and diplomats. The base of the industrialisation of the national republics was provided, above all, by the Russian industrial areas.

The Russian working class and the entire Russian people have had to exert every effort in order to stamp out estrangement and enmity between the different nations and nationalities of Russia, to uproot the vestiges and influences of Great-Power chauvinism and to abolish the actual national inequality. The accomplishments of the Russian working class are a brilliant example, an example with lasting historic significance, of how the workers of developed and advanced nations can fulfil their internationalist duties.

---

* *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, pp. 91-92.

Chapter Four

THE PEOPLES' LIBERATION STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

> The union and friendship of all its nations and nationalities withstood the grim trials of the Great Patriotic War, during which the sons and daughters of the Soviet Motherland not only succeeded in safeguarding with honour their socialist gains, but also saved world civilisation from the barbarity of fascism, thereby lending powerful support to the people's liberation struggle.
>
> *L. I. Brezhnev*

Even during the First World War and the October Revolution the capitalist system moved into a period of general crisis which extended to every sphere of life—the economy, politics, ideology and international relations. The further extension of the general crisis of capitalism, the mounting struggle for spheres of influence, markets and sources of raw materials and the redivision of the world between the imperialist blocs brought about a sharp aggravation of international tensions. Having quickly recovered from its defeat in the First World War, imperialist Germany pretended to new spheres of influence, to a redivision of the colonies, and strove for world domination once again. Supported by nazi Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan also openly voiced territorial claims, threatening the independence of European and Asian peoples. Germany, Japan and Italy, considering themselves to have been 'cheated of their share', declared with increasing stridency that they did not have enough sources of raw material, markets or spheres

for capital investment. They were clamouring for 'living space' and for a new division of the world in their favour. The old colonial powers—Britain, France and the United States—did not, however, propose to yield their positions. This caused a sharp aggravation of contradictions in the world capitalist system.

THE SOVIET UNION'S STRIVING FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Lenin's prophetic statements were borne out. 'Imperialism,' he wrote as far back as 1915, 'means the progressively mounting oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of Great Powers; it means a period of wars between the latter to extend and consolidate the oppression of nations; it means a period in which the masses of the people are deceived by hypocritical social-patriots, i.e., individuals who, *under the pretext* of the "freedom of nations", "the right of nations to self-determination", and "defence of the fatherland", justify and defend the oppression of the majority of the world's nations by the Great Powers.'*

The imperialist countries were unanimous in their hatred of the Soviet Union. They sought to destroy the land of socialism, hoping thereby to resolve their internal conflicts. These countries masked their aggressive policies with anti-Soviet and anti-communist slogans and were to some extent united by the class struggle against the Soviet socialist state, the international working class and the national liberation movement. The idea of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with opposing social systems, which permeated the Decree on Peace and other acts of the young Soviet Republic, published so many years ago, was undermined by the imperialist cliques, contrary to the national interests of their peoples.

This provides the key to the understanding of the diplomatic history and the entire kaleidoscopic picture of international relations in that period. The documents and other materials from Western state archives, which were

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination', *op. cit.*, Vol. 21, p. 409.

recently made public, put it beyond doubt that the British, French and American imperialists encouraged the aggressive preparations of the fascist states. In order to retain their positions they tried to direct nazi aggression against the Soviet Union, hoping in this way to crush the first socialist country in the world and simultaneously to see their imperialist rivals crippled by a war with the USSR. This policy allowed the fascist states to commit one aggression after another with impunity.

Here is a brief account of the development of German-Italian and Japanese aggression in the 1930s. In 1931-1937, the Japanese invaded North-East and Central China, occupying many Chinese provinces. In 1935, fascist Italy occupied Abyssinia (Ethiopia), and in 1936 and 1937, nazi Germany and Italy staged an armed intervention in the Spanish Republic, installing General Franco in power. Germany, Italy and Japan concluded an aggressive military alliance, known as the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis, which they named the 'Anti-Comintern Pact'. Nazi Germany was rapidly completing its militarisation programme with the assistance of the Western powers. In March 1938, Austria was occupied by Hitler's troops and was incorporated into Germany (this event is known as the Anschluss). In October 1938 in Munich the British Prime Minister, Chamberlain, and Premier Daladier of France agreed with Hitler and Mussolini on the partition of Czechoslovakia and the transfer of a part of its territory to Germany. In March 1939 Czechoslovakia was occupied by the nazis.

The world slipped further into war. The ruling circles of Britain, France and the United States, however, still thought to 'localise' the aggression by directing it towards the USSR. Taking advantage of the strained situation in Europe, the Japanese militarists twice performed acts of provocation against the Soviet Union—at Lake Khasan, in July and August 1938, and at the Khalkhin-Gol River, in the Mongolian People's Republic, in May and June 1939—but were routed.

Correctly appraising the situation, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government launched an intensive effort to prepare the country to repulse the impending aggression. The necessary material requisites to defend the

Soviet Union had been built up during thirteen years of the prewar five-year plan periods, and also thanks to the collectivisation of agriculture and a general upsurge in the cultural standards of the people.

Faithful to the Leninist policy of peace, the Soviet Union simultaneously mounted a strong effort to organise European security and promote the international mass struggles to counter the growing military threat from the fascist brigands. The Soviet Union suggested to France, Britain, Czechoslovakia and Poland a concrete plan for a joint armed rebuff to the nazi aggressors, but the ruling circles of these countries, blinded by their hatred of socialism and ignoring the masses' desire for peace, balked at military-political cooperation with the USSR. In the summer of 1939 the governments of Britain and France resorted to diplomatic manoeuvres, declaring their wish to cooperate with the Soviet Union, while actually conducting secret negotiations with Hitler's emissaries, seeking to turn the fascist-Hitlerite coalition against the Soviet Union.

The nazi leaders, for their part, were aware that a war with the USSR would require a tremendous effort and wanted first to assure their security in Europe so as to be able to build up their forces and protect themselves against a stab in the back from their rivals in the struggle for world supremacy.

The Soviet leaders were confronted by a difficult problem. They could allow the country to be drawn right away into a war with the Third Reich, in a position of international isolation, owing to the policy of Britain, France and the United States; or they could try to gain time to provide for Soviet security by concluding a non-aggression pact with Germany. The Soviet Government had earlier declined repeated invitations to discuss such a pact. But the obvious reluctance of the governments of Britain and France to sign a treaty of mutual assistance with the Soviet Union and the fact that they were trying to reach an understanding with Germany at the Soviet Union's expense, compelled the Soviet Government to accept the German offer of a non-aggression pact, which was signed in August 1939. It staved off the attack and gave the Soviet Union a breathing-spell of

almost two years during which the country's defence capacity was further built up.

PROLETARIAN SOLIDARITY AGAINST FASCISM

In striving to ensure peace and collective security, and to avert a second world war, the Soviet Union relied on the support and solidarity of the international communist and working-class movements and of all peace forces. The Communist International (Comintern), founded by Lenin in 1919, played an enormous part in rallying the working people to avert the menace of war. The Comintern's activities in rebuffing the imperialist forces are a lesson of lasting historic significance. Lenin and the Comintern spared no efforts to help the masses understand their responsibility for safeguarding socialism and peace, to shed non-class pacifist illusions, and to see the fundamental difference between imperialist wars of conquest, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, just wars in defence of the socialist motherland and the struggle of the working and oppressed people to throw off the imperialist yoke.

In working out and implementing the internationalist ideas of a common labour front and of a joint struggle of workers from different political parties and organisations, the Executive Committee of the Comintern pointed out that the struggle for socialism and peace against the aggressive imperialist forces was a common internationalist proletarian cause and that this struggle provided the foundation on which the energetic efforts of the diverse contingents of the working people were to be united.

The policy statement issued by the Sixth Comintern Congress (1928) stressed that the foreign policy of the USSR, which reflected the interests of the international proletariat, was a policy of peace. Its aim was to protect the constructive work performed in the Soviet Union and to avert military confrontation for as long as possible. This policy opposed imperialist wars and rapacious colonial campaigns, and the pacifism which served as a mask for them. 'The fight against Fascism in all its forms,'

the Congress pointed out, 'must be closely linked up with the fight against imperialist war.'*

In that period the Communists became the international force which roused the masses to fight against reaction, fascism and war, against economic crises, unemployment and poverty, and to fight for the fundamental interests of the working class, for peace, and the defence of the socialist Land of Soviets. Mass demonstrations of working people against the menace of an imperialist war, held on August 1, became part of the combatant tradition. The General Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, Georgi Dimitrov, leader of the Bulgarian working class, evaluated the situation in 1936 as follows: 'Looking back, we may be pleased to say that ever since 1929, we, the Communist parties, the Communist International, have been the first to raise squarely the question of mass mobilisation against imperialist war, in favour of peace.'**

The Communist parties played a vanguard role in the struggle against fascism, against the growing threat of another world war, at the same time emphasizing general democratic objectives. Circumstances were now propitious for united action not only by the working class, but also by very diverse groups of people who were vitally interested in defending the democratic freedoms won by the working people, and in opposing fascism and war. The spirit of internationalism and concern for the future of mankind permeated the Manifesto which was adopted by an Anti-War Congress at Amsterdam in August 1932 and which read: 'By virtue of the mandate entrusted to it by a multitude of people assembled from all the corners of the world, who belong to diverse trends but are united in their sincere and ardent desire for peace ... the Congress enjoins the masses, the sole invincible force in the tragic chaos of contemporary times, to move their disciplined serried ranks against this chaos and make their resolute voice heard against it.'***

---

* *Resolution of the VI World Congress of the Communist International*, July-August 1928, p. 59.

** *Kommunist*, No. 8, 1972, p. 27.

*** *L'Humanité*, No. 12322, 8 September 1932.

The Congress decisions were aimed at a further internationalist consolidation of the broadest masses in order to eliminate the threat of another world war. Evaluating the results of the Congress, G. Dimitrov wrote: 'The anti-military congress at Amsterdam and the Amsterdam anti-war movement ... as far back as 1932 provided the first massive stimulus for the establishment of a united front and posed this problem more concretely among the social-democratic ranks and in the social-democratic parties.' *

The Communist parties substantially altered their strategy and tactics in view of the changed international situation (especially after the nazis had seized power in Germany) and on the basis of the experience amassed by the working-class movement in the struggle against the fascist menace mainly in France, Austria and Spain. It was considered particularly important to encourage intense opposition to sectarianism, a stereotyped approach and schematism, as these greatly hampered the efforts to create a united front in the peoples' struggle against the threat of fascism and the outbreak of another war, and to enlist in this struggle those sections that were not already in contact with the communist parties.

The historic Seventh Congress of the Comintern (July-August 1935) centered its attention on building up the working people's internationalist unity against fascism and another world war. The Congress pointed out that the most dangerous of all was German fascism which was acting 'as the spearhead of international counter-revolution, as the chief instigator of imperialist war, as the initiator of a crusade against the Soviet Union...'.** 'The next war,' said Palmiro Togliatti, leader of the Italian Communists, 'will be a war against the workers, against women and children; it will be a war of extermination. It will be a fascist war.' ***

The Seventh Comintern Congress put forward the

---

* *Antivoyenniye traditsii mezhdunarodnogo rabochego dvizheniya* (International Working-Class Movement: Anti-Military Traditions), Moscow, 1972, p. 292.

** *VII Congress of the Communist International*, Moscow, 1939, p. 126.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 446.

important thesis that tne aims of Soviet peace policy and those of the policy of the working class and the communist countries were completely identical. It was further pointed out that 'at the present historic stage it is the main and immediate task of the international labour movement to establish the united fighting front of the working class'.*

The Congress appealed for the establishment of a united labour front, to act as the basis of a broad Popular Front, which would unite all anti-fascist democratic forces. The Congress supported the establishment of an anti-imperialist Popular Front, which would include all national liberation forces, in the colonial and dependent countries. The paramount duty of the international working class, the Congress ruled, was to 'help with all their might and with all the means at their disposal to strengthen the USSR and to fight against the enemies of the USSR'.** Action in defence and support of the Soviet Union was one of the main directions of the class struggle of the world proletariat at that time.

In spite of the efforts of the Soviet Union and all progressive anti-fascist and peace forces, the Second World War was not averted, and a broad united popular front to fight fascism and war was not set up. Between 1935 and 1939 the Comintern ten times proposed joint action against fascism and war to the Socialist International and was ten times refused. Nor was any response given to the communist parties' proposals to call an international conference to organise the struggle against fascism and the impending threat of war.

HITLER'S PLANS TO EXTERMINATE AND ENSLAVE THE PEOPLES

On 1 September 1939 nazi Germany attacked Poland, beginning the Second World War which lasted six years, in the course of which fifty million people died and

* *Ibid.*, p. 17.
** *Ibid.*, p. 55.

thirty-five million were disabled.* In the initial period it was an imperialist war between two capitalist coalitions, but for the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia and, later on, Yugoslavia it immediately assumed the character of a just war of liberation.

The German military, monopolies and junkers now hatched their colonialist plans to dominate the world; the first step was to defeat the Soviet Union. The nazis clothed their plans in the cosmopolitan-racialist concept of 'great economic spaces'. They alleged that modern productive forces and transport had transcended and made 'obsolete' such things as the independence of states, national sovereignty and, consequently, state boundaries.

According to the nazis, the dominant positions in the world must belong to the 'pure-bred nations', the Aryans, and not to those races and peoples who were allegedly 'inferior' psychologically and biologically. Struggle between races and nations, i.e., a 'biologically determined' struggle for survival, was mechanically transferred to the realm of social relations and proclaimed to be basic to history as a whole.

Nazi plans of colonial enslavement and mass extermination were made with the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in mind. The nazis depicted the Soviet Union as an empire of 'Bolshevik-European usurpers', which the 'higher Aryan race' was supposedly called upon to destroy. Even before attacking the USSR, Hitler said: '*We are obliged to depopulate* as part of our mission of preserving the German population. We shall have to develop a technique of depopulation. ...If I can send the flower of the German nation into the hell of war without the smallest pity for the spilling of precious German blood, then surely I have the right to remove millions of an inferior race that breeds like vermin!'** Detailed plans were drawn up to deliberately exterminate entire peoples—the Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Poles, Serbians, Jews, Czechs and others.

Hitler said in a confidential conversation: 'Even before

---

* In the First World War ten million were killed and twenty million disabled.

** Hermann Rauschning, *The Voice of Destruction*, N. Y., 1940, p. 137.

taking over power, we must make it clear to the English, the French, as well as the Americans and the Vatican, that sooner or later we shall be compelled to wage a crusade against Bolshevism. Britain and France should be thankful to us, that we have recognised the danger in good time. It is none of their business who governs Russia tomorrow. We must think right now about the resettlement of millions of people from Germany and Europe.... We must colonise the East ruthlessly.'*

Hitler's plan for world domination included the establishment of a 'strong core' in the centre of Europe, consisting of Germany, Austria, and a part of Czechoslovakia and Poland. Vassal puppet states such as Finland, Hungary, Serbia, Romania, Belgium, Holland, Greece, would be disposed around that 'core'. The territory of Slav countries was to be settled by Germans, after their native population had been either massacred or turned into German slaves. Plans developed after the outbreak of war stated that France was to be smashed, Britain deprived of her independence, and the United States partitioned. The whole Latin American continent was included in Germany's 'living space'. The lunatic Führer harangued his listeners: 'Not provinces but geopolitics, not minorities but continents, not defeat but extermination of the enemy, not allies but satellites, not the shifting of boundaries but the reshuffling of the globe, not a Peace Treaty but a death sentence: these should be the perspectives of Grand War.'**

As the occupation of European countries by nazi troops proceeded, the German press declared more and more persistently that German domination over Europe was the key to the 'New Order'. 'The Third Reich is Europe, and the Europe of tomorrow shall coincide with the notion of Greater Germany'—this statement in the newspaper *Das Reich* on 7 January 1941 was repeated by nazi propaganda over and over again, with minor variations.

The nazis changed the boundaries of whole states and their constituent republics and regions just as they

---

* E. Calic, *Ohne Maske. Hitler-Breiting Geheimgespräche,* Societäts-Verlag, 1968, S. 100.

** H. E. Fried, *The Guilt of the German Army,* N. Y., 1943, p. 10.

pleased. They partitioned Czechoslovakia into the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia and the puppet state of Slovakia. Having occupied Poland, they incorporated the greater part of it in the Reich, and formed the rest (the Krakow, Warsaw, Lublin and Radom departments) into a governorship general centred on Krakow. On assuming office as Governor General of Poland, Hans Frank publicly declared on 3 October 1939: 'Poland shall be treated like a colony; the Poles will become the slaves of the Greater German World Empire.'*

The nazis were feverishly developing their plans to seize new territories and plunder their economic resources. A secret memorandum by the Deputy Director of the Economic Policy Department of the German Foreign Ministry mentioned three priority issues of the 'future economic organisation of the world', which were, (1) the *Greater* German economic sphere, (2) the German colonial empire, and (3) the reconstruction of German foreign trade after the war.** The 'Greater German economic sphere' meant not only the already occupied territories of Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland but also other territories to be annexed in the West (Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg and Norway first and the rest of capitalist Europe later). The countries of North-East Europe were to be placed under the absolute control of nazi Germany. The whole of South-East Europe was to become a source of raw material for the 'Greater German economic sphere' and part of German industrial output was also to be realised there.

Such would be the 'New Order' in Europe; it was mentioned with increasing frequency in German official documents and propaganda from the late 1930s. The term obviously implied enslavement of the European peoples, division of the world into separate 'living spaces' on a racial principle, with each race setting up the 'New Order' in its 'living space' in conformity with its own particular characteristics. Essentially it was a matter of redividing the world altogether in Germany's favour on

---

* IMT, Vol. XXII, p. 542.

** *Documents on German Foreign Policy. 1918-1945,* Ser. D, Vol. IX, p. 476.

the basis of large, geographically contiguous areas, ruled by the 'master race'.

The programme of abolishing the independence of East European countries, instituted as official policy, was given concrete embodiment in the 'General Plan East' [der Generalplan Ost], one of history's most inhuman documents. The Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians, Czechs and Poles were to be forcibly Germanised and turned into slaves. Tens of millions of people from Poland and the western part of the Soviet Union were to be resettled in Siberia and replaced by Germans; the remainder was to be Germanised. A proportion of the Germanised native population, Byelorussians in particular, were to be 'brought to the Reich as labour power'.*

The nazis prepared in good time—even before perfidiously attacking the Soviet Union—for the mass extermination of Soviet citizens. On 12 May 1941 the German High Command issued an order The Treatment of Political and Military Russian Functionaries: they were to be shot on the spot, not evacuated to the rear.** There followed on 13 May a decree concerning the Exercise of Military Jurisdiction in the 'Barbarossa' area, which enforced summary executions of peaceful civilians, without trial or investigation ('suspected elements will forthwith be brought before an officer who will decide whether they are to be shot'***). Thus, the elementary rules of international law were replaced by gross violence and terror.

The Italian fascists behaved in much the same way in the occupied territories. Even before the beginning of the Second World War, Italy had seized Ethiopia and Albania and attacked Greece. Hitler and Mussolini reached an understanding on the delimitation of spheres of expan-

---

* See *Sovershenno Secretno! Tolko dlya Komandovaniya! Strategiya fashistskoi Germanii v voine protiv SSSR. Dokumenty i materialy.* (Top Secret! Restricted to the Command! Nazi Germany's Strategy in the War Against the USSR. Documents and Materials), Moscow, 1967, pp. 108-16, 120.

** See *Nyurnbergski protsess nad glavnymi nemetskimi voyennymi prestupnikami* (Nürnberg Trial of the Major German War Criminals. Collected Documents), Moscow, 1958, Vol. 3, p. 94.

*** C. A. Dixon and O. Heilbrunn, *Communist Guerilla Warfare*, London, 1954, p. 103.

sion in the Balkans and the Danube basin. The Romanian fascists tried to keep pace with the other coalition members. They expected to have seized Odessa and the adjacent territory by the end of the war, in order to create 'Greater Romania', a vassal of nazi Germany.

The Japanese militarists pursued a similar programme of conquest. After occupying North-East China in the early thirties, and turning it into an anti-Soviet bridgehead and a base for further aggression against China, Japan in August 1936 adopted a decision on the Fundamental Principles of National Policy. According to these Principles, Japan was to become, both in name and in fact, a 'stabilising force in East Asia'. They also envisaged the elimination of the alleged 'threat from the North, from the Soviet Union', the readiness to 'meet Britain and America equipped with adequate arms due to our further economic development, consequent upon close cooperation between Japan, Manchuria and China', and the 'national and economic advance to the south, especially to the South Sea countries'.*

The Japanese military sought to halt the independent national development of the Asian peoples. Under the 'three-power pact' of 1940 (concluded between Germany, Italy, and Japan), which sought to divide the world into spheres of influence, the guidance and establishment of the 'New Order' in the 'great East Asian area' was reserved for Japan, whose 'right' to China, India, Indochina, Thailand, Australia and Oceania was particularly mentioned.

Putting forward the sham slogan 'Asia for the Asians', the Japanese aggressors sought to represent their expansion as a war between Asians and Europeans. The Japanese press and militarists bragged that the Japanese were superior among the non-White nations and were called upon to rid a thousand million people of the fetters of Anglo-Saxon supremacy, to establish the 'new order', and set up the great East Asian sphere of 'co-prosperity'.

The Japanese tried to solve the economic problems in that 'sphere' by subjugating industry in the occupied

---

* See *Istoriya voiny na Tikhom okeane* (History of the War in the Pacific), Vol. 2, Moscow, 1957, pp. 340-41.

countries and exporting strategic raw materials from them. To administer the conquered territories, a Ministry of Greater East Asia was set up in Tokyo. The invaders cruelly oppressed the native population. They rapaciously exploited natural resources, and carried away foodstuffs without the slightest regard to the needs of the native population. Thailand and Indochina, Indonesia and the Philippines, Burma and the occupied provinces of China delivered industrial raw materials and foodstuffs to Japan, in exchange for promises to supply manufactured goods to them.

In order to defeat nazi Germany and its allies, all freedom-loving, progressive forces of the world had to be mobilised. This historic mission fell, above all, to the Soviet people and the international working class.

THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE (1941-1945)

At dawn on 22 June 1941, nazi Germany perfidiously attacked the Soviet Union, supported by Finland, Italy, Romania and Hungary. A battle of unprecedented scale began between the attacking forces of imperialism and the first socialist power in history. 'In the war with nazi Germany that has been imposed on us, lies the question of whether the Soviet state shall live on or perish, whether the peoples of the Soviet Union will be free or enslaved,'* ran a letter of instructions addressed by the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) to Party branches and Soviet organisations in regions near the front on 29 June 1941.

The attack by nazi Germany and its satellites on the Soviet Union marked the beginning of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people. In the USSR, the nazi hordes not only encountered staunch organised resistance for the first time, but also began to suffer major reverses and

---

* *KPSS o Vooruzhennykh Silakh Sovetskogo Soyuza. Dokumenty 1917-1968* (CPSU on the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union. Documents 1917-1968), Moscow, 1969, p. 301.

defeats. The heroic defence of Leningrad, Odessa, Sevastopol, Kiev, Novorossiisk, and Brest and the victorious battle on the approaches to Moscow were of immense significance to the course and outcome of the Second World War.

When the Soviet Union entered the war, it made the rout of nazi Germany a real possibility. It laid bare the fascist states' criminal military aims, and ultimately turned the Second World War into a just war, a war of liberation.

When the Western governments had gauged the full extent of the danger which Hitler's plans for 'world domination' represented to them, they revised their policy toward the USSR and initiated military and political cooperation with it. As a result an anti-Hitler coalition was formed on the initiative of the Soviet Union. This coalition was based not only on international treaties and agreements, but also on a joint armed struggle in Europe and Asia, in which Communists and the working class took an active, ar d often a leading, part.

The brunt of the war was borne by the Soviet people and its heroic Armed Forces. In the fields of the Great Patriotic War the most aggressive forces of imperialism clashed with socialism.

The war was a test of all the material and spiritual forces of the Soviet people and the entire Soviet socialist state, social and economic system. Simultaneously, it was a test of the monolithic unity of Soviet society and the friendship between peoples of which Lenin had spoken. It put to the proof the vitality and strength of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the cohesion of the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union.

The nazis expected the multinational Soviet socialist state to disintegrate after its first serious military trials, and in this way hoped to find support for their ideology of national strife and enmity.

All such hopes, however, came to nothing. Grim experiences did not cause the Soviet nations to disagree among themselves; on the contrary all the republics of the USSR formed a united military camp.

L. I. Brezhnev said: 'If one is to speak of the main hero of the Great Patriotic War this immortal hero is the entire close-knit family of the peoples inhabiting our

country and cemented by the indestructible bonds of friendship.... The Party's Leninist nationalities policy had stood the test of the war. Fascism failed to drive a wedge between the socialist nations. Their fraternal alliance demonstrated its strength and viability and was a major source of our victory over the fascist invaders.'*

The Soviet people combined ardent patriotism with profound socialist internationalism. They were aware that the purpose of the Great Patriotic War was not only to eliminate the danger that faced the USSR but also to aid all European peoples to overthrow and defeat nazism. The Soviet soldiers, partisans and workers in the rear had a great liberating task to perform, and they proved worthy of it. The Soviet working people were seized by one desire expressed in the slogan, 'All for the front, all for victory!'

The titanic military conflict with the forces of fascist aggression revealed the strength of the Soviet social and state system and of socialist ideology, the most progressive in the world. The war years furnished vivid proof of the superiority of the Soviet system over capitalism. The socialist economic system, the moral and political unity of Soviet society, and the friendship of peoples were inexhaustible sources of strength to the Soviet Union.

The nazis were to experience at first hand the profound truth of the Marxist tenet that the defence capacity of a socialist country was many times greater than that of a capitalist country; that whereas the capitalist system, a system of exploitation and national oppression engenders the weakness inherent in capitalist society, the abolition of exploitation and national oppression under socialism results in an internal and invincible consolidation of all forces of society, which is a source of mass heroism.

When the imperialists assumed that the economic and human reserves of occupied Europe would prevail over the Soviet Union's resources they made a gross miscalculation. In 1918, when the Soviet Republic had had nothing like the potential it had on the eve of the Great Patriotic War, Lenin said: 'He who turns away from the socialist

---

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Leninskim kursom. Rechi i statii* (Following Lenin's Course), Vol. 1, Moscow, 1973, p. 137.

revolution now taking place in Russia and points to the obvious disproportion of forces is like the conservative "man in a muffler" who cannot see further than his nose, who forgets that not a single historical change of any importance takes place without there being several instances of a disproportion of forces. Forces grow in the process of the struggle, as the revolution grows.'*

The scope of the Soviet achievement in moving industrial enterprises and evacuating people to the East from the area of hostilities is still a source of amazement to the West. During three months in 1941 more than 1,360 large factories were moved, using 1.5 million railway cars. Another major evacuation effort (from Kharkov, the Donets Basin and the Kuban) took place in the spring and summer of 1942. Altogether more than ten million people were evacuated. The factories moved to the rear were put into working order within the space of three or four weeks. Numerous munitions factories, iron and steel works, power plants and collieries were built throughout the war. Thanks to the high tempo of construction, the eastern areas (the Volga area, the Urals, Siberia, Kazakhstan and Central Asia) had become the country's main military-industrial base by the spring of 1942.

The shift of industry and population to the East also had important consequences for the postwar development of the eastern areas, as their relative share of industry and industrial workers increased and the fraternal friendship and international cohesion of the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union were strengthened.

The problem of finding room for the evacuees was solved no less successfully than the transfer of industry. By the spring of 1942 about 600,000 were settled in the Kazakh SSR, 716,000 in the Uzbek SSR, and 100,000 in the Kirghiz SSR. The local people and authorities made the evacuees welcome and provided them with everything necessary for a normal existence—such were the fruits of internationalist education and of the Leninist policy of friendship and brotherhood of the peoples of the USSR.

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Speech at the First Congress of Economic Councils', *op. cit.*, Vol. 27, Moscow, 1965, pp. 412-13.

The Great Patriotic War at first proceeded in a way unfavourable to the Soviet Union and advantageous to the enemy. Exploiting the element of surprise and their temporary superiority in strength and equipment the nazi hordes advanced far into the country. In spite of the heroic resistance of Soviet troops, the nazis had seized the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldavia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and some western regions of the Russian Federation by the end of November 1941. Wherever they set foot they pursued a policy of mass extermination of civilians and prisoners of war.

The nazi ruling clique were planning the destruction of the major Soviet cities and cultural centres, and the extermination of the population. Thus, a secret letter to the Naval Chief of Staff on 29 September 1941, which referred to Hitler's decision of 22 September to totally destroy Leningrad, read: 'The Führer has decided to erase from the face of the earth St. Petersburg. The existence of this large city will have no further interest after Soviet Russia is destroyed.... It is proposed to approach near to the city and to destroy it with the aid of artillery barrage from all weapons of different caliber and with large air attacks.... The problems of the life of the population and the provisioning of them is a problem which cannot and must not be decided by us. In this war ... we are not interested in preserving even a part of the population of this large city.'* The secret directives of the Wehrmacht High Command, referring to Hitler's order on 7 October 1941, stated: 'The Führer has again decided that a capitulation of Leningrad or, later, of Moscow is not to be accepted even if it is offered by the enemy.... By our fire we must force all who try to leave the city through our lines to turn back.... Before the cities are taken they are to be weakened by artillery fire and air attacks, and their population should be caused to flee.'**

Blinded by their racist and chauvinist ideology, the German soldiers desecrated the graves and the memorial museums of great representatives of Russian and world

---

* Leon Goure, *The Siege of Leningrad*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1962, pp. 141-42.

** *Ibid.*, p. 142.

culture—Pushkin, Tolstoy and Tchaikovsky; they looted and destroyed cultural monuments—the churches of Novgorod, the palaces near Leningrad, and so on. This was intended to make Soviet people forget all about their great culture and accept that only the 'Aryan race' had a developed culture.

The nazis applied their tactics of stirring up national strife in the Soviet Union on a wide scale. 'Our policy with regard to the peoples inhabiting the broad Russian expanses,' Hitler insisted, 'must be to encourage differences and schism in whatever shape.'* For example, Ukrainian nationalist traitors took part in operations against Russian and Byelorussian guerillas; conflicts between Latvians and Lithuanians, Estonians and Russians were provoked in the Baltic area; groups of Latvian chauvinist fascists were sent to the Leningrad Region to carry out punitive operations; anti-Semitism was fostered everywhere.

The Central Committee of the Party and the Soviet Government called on all Soviet citizens, soldiers and seamen to defend every inch of ground, to fight to the last drop of their blood for Soviet towns and villages, and to develop guerilla warfare behind enemy lines. Party branches and Soviet organisations were requested to proffer every possible assistance to the army in the field, to consolidate the rear, to supply the army with everything it needed, to enable all industrial establishments to work at full capacity.

The valiant Soviet Army reflected the multinational composition of Soviet society, making the fighting community of the peoples of the USSR a reality. Thus, in 200 infantry divisions numbering over one million men, at various times in 1943 Russians accounted for 58.3 to 65.6 per cent, Ukrainians—11.6 to 22.8, Uzbeks—2 to 4.4, Kazakhs—1.6 to 3, Tatars—1.8 to 2.7, Byelorussians—1.3 to 2.6, Azerbaijanians—1.4 to 1.7, Georgians—1.2 to 1.8, Armenians—1.4 to 1.8, Jews—1.3 to 1.6, Estonians—0.9 to 1.3, Mordvinians—0.6 to 0.9, Chuvashi—0.6 to 0.9, Tajiks—0.2 to 0.9, Kirghizes—0.4 to 0.8, Bashkirs—

---

* *Sovershenno secretno! Tolko dlya Komandovaniya!* ... (Top Secret! Restricted to the Command!...), p. 118.

0.3 to 0.6, Latvians—0.2 to 0.3, Lithuanians—0.1 to 0.3, and the peoples of Daghestan—0.1 to 0.3 per cent.*

It became particularly important for the servicemen of non-Russian nationalities to know Russian, as orders and manuals were issued in that language. It was the basis of communication and common action in the Soviet Army.

Thus, the causes of class, liberation, humanitarianism and internationalism merged into one in the Soviet people's struggle to rout the enemy. Among Heroes of the Soviet Union** during the Great Patriotic War there were 8,160 Russians, 2,069 Ukrainians, 309 Byelorussians, 161 Tatars, 108 Jews, 96 Kazakhs, 90 Armenians, 90 Georgians, 69 Uzbeks, 61 Mordvinians, 44 Chuvashi, 43 Azerbaijanians, 39 Bashkirs, 32 Ossets, 18 Mari, 18 Turkmens, 15 Lithuanians, 14 Tajiks, 13 Latvians, 12 Kirghizes, 10 Komi, 10 Udmurts, 9 Karelians, 9 Estonians, 8 Kalmyks, 7 Kabardinians, 6 Adygei, 5 Abkhazians, 3 Yakuts, and representatives of other Soviet socialist nationalities.

While the Great Patriotic War was a just war of liberation for the peoples of the Soviet Union, it was at the same time essentially international in social terms and in its influence on the destinies of the peoples of the world. On temporarily occupied Soviet territory a mass guerilla movement developed; it was jointly supported by representatives of all Soviet nationalities together with Polish, Czechoslovak, Hungarian, Romanian, German, French, Italian and Spanish working people. The guerilla formations and underground organisations on temporarily occupied Soviet territory in the enemy rear, which did active damage to the enemy, numbered over a million Soviet citizens. The struggle against nazi hordes rallied the socialist Soviet nations even more closely round the Leninist Party, elevating the socialist, international and patriotic awareness of Soviet people to an unprecedented height.

---

* Cf. *Sovetsky Soyuz—velikoye sodruzhestvo narodov-bratyev* (The Soviet Union—the Great Community of Fraternal Peoples), Moscow, 1972, p. 200.

** The title of Hero of the Soviet Union is conferred in recognition of extraordinary courage and heroism.

Leonid Brezhnev pointed out that 'the Soviet people's great feat in the years of the Great Patriotic War is inseparable from the many-sided and purposeful activity of the Communist Party. Its Central Committee was the headquarters which exercised the supreme political and strategic leadership of the military operations. It was the Party which organised and united tens of millions of men and women, directing their energies, their will and their activity towards the single goal of victory. The war provided ample confirmation that the Party and the people are united, and that there is no force that can shake this invincible unity'.*

The war demonstrated the inseparable, organic link between Soviet patriotism and proletarian, socialist internationalism. 'Patriotism,' Lenin wrote, 'is one of the most deeply ingrained sentiments, inculcated by the existence of separate fatherlands for hundreds and thousands of years.'** In the distant past, too, whenever a fatherland was threatened by foreign enslavement, the masses rose to repel the menace. The nazi brigands, aiming to nail the Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, Serbians, Belgians, French and other European peoples to the cross of the 'New Order', aroused the patriotic wrath of the Soviet people and other peoples, a wrath which ultimately swept away the imperialist German Reich.

The war revealed the depth of Lenin's idea that the 'fatherland is an historical concept'.*** In the Soviet people's heroic struggle patriotism also manifested itself as a sentiment characteristic of the numerous Soviet nationalities imbued with the solidarity of the working people and their aspirations for the international consolidation of their forces. It was a sentiment which had developed during ages of joint activities and movement towards liberation.

Soviet patriotism was seen in the course of the last war to be truly international. It harmoniously combined love of the native country, ardent devotion to the Soviet

---

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, pp. 553-54.

** V. I. Lenin, 'The Valuable Admissions of Pitirim Sorokin', *op. cit.*, Vol. 28, Moscow, 1965, p. 187.

*** V. I. Lenin, 'To Inessa Armand, November 30, 1916', *op. cit.*, Vol. 35, Moscow, 1973, p. 250.

Motherland, and the lofty and noble understanding that the land of socialism was the workers' own land. The patriotism felt by the Soviet people combines love of their own country and respect for other peoples, for their rights; it is profoundly and essentially humanitarian. Soviet socialist patriotism and internationalism are one; they stand against nationalism and cosmopolitanism.

On 30 April 1945 Soviet troops hoisted the Red Flag of Victory over the Reichstag. On 9 May representatives of the defeated Reich agreed to unconditional surrender. A few months later Soviet Armed Forces routed the carefully constituted Kwantung Army in Manchuria. On September 1945 the capitulation of Japan was signed in Tokyo. The Second World War had ended in victory for the anti-fascist coalition.

Hitlerism was no historical accident; it was the most sinister product of imperialism. The evil that arose from the secret recesses of imperialism, a cancerous evil that had been eating at the apparently strong and prosperous imperialist world, was now revealed to the peoples of the world. Hitlerism was evidence of the calamity threatening mankind. The murderous 'New Order' in Europe, the ovens of Buchenwald and Maidanek, are indelible lessons.

Racial hatred, the domination by 'master' nations, the subjugation of other nations and seizure of their territory, the economic enslavement of the subjugated peoples and the pillage of their national wealth, the abolition of democratic freedom and introduction of the fascist Hitlerite regime of terror—these combined to turn all the freedom-loving peoples into enemies of Hitlerism.

Conversely, the programme of the Soviet Army was a programme of internationalism and international working-class solidarity, of peace and friendship among peoples; it aimed to abolish racial exclusiveness and to establish national equality, to return democratic freedoms, to abolish the nazi regime, and liberate the enslaved peoples and restore to them their sovereign rights; it was a programme of economic aid to the nations which had suffered and assistance to them in their efforts to achieve material well-being. This lofty programme and the Soviet Union's manifest respect for the rights of other peoples combined to engender friendship towards the USSR

among those European peoples that had been delivered from nazi tyranny.

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War entailed an immense increase in its influence and furthered the spread of the ideas of socialism and internationalism throughout the world. The collapse of nazism and Japanese militarism abruptly undermined the influence of racism and national-chauvinism. Nevertheless, imperialism did not change and nor did its reactionary and aggressive forces. One can still find reactionary bourgeois Western writers who try to whitewash Hitlerism and its crimes against humanity.

The Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War finally brought about the return of the territories seized by force by the imperialists (Bessarabia, parts of the Western Ukraine and Byelorussia) and the reunification of all Moldavians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians within the Soviet socialist state.

The Soviet Army brought freedom to many European peoples. Victory in the war would have been impossible without the joint international effort of all Soviet socialist nations, without their close cooperation and mutual assistance. 'The most convincing expression of the Soviet people's unity was the heroic exploits in defence of the socialist Motherland. The union and friendship of all its nations and nationalities withstood the grim trials of the Great Patriotic War, during which the sons and daughters of the Soviet Motherland not only succeeded in safeguarding with honour their socialist gains, but also saved world civilisation from the barbarity of fascism, thereby lending powerful support to the peoples' liberation struggle. The glory of this country's heroes, its valiant defenders, will endure through the ages.'*

More than twenty million Soviet citizens lost their lives during the Great Patriotic War. Besides the military casualties the Soviet people suffered great losses as a result of the very high death rate in the nazi-occupied Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Baltic area and some densely populated parts of the Russian Federation, and also as the result of the deportation of many Soviet citizens to forced

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, pp. 73-74.

labour camps in Germany and of an abrupt decrease in the birth rate. Direct material damage caused to the Soviet Union amounted towards the end of the war to 679,000 million roubles (at 1941 rates), which approximately equals the expenditure on the construction of new factories, power plants, railways, state farms, machine-and-tractor stations and other concerns during the previous twenty years. This sum does not include losses from the closure of factories or the reduction in their output, Soviet military expenditures, the losses incurred through the general deceleration of national economic development, or other financial losses.*

Over vast areas, towns and villages lay in ruins. The nazi invaders destroyed or burned down 1,710 towns and urban-type settlements and more than 70,000 villages, altogether more than six million buildings, leaving almost 25 million persons homeless. Major industrial cities and cultural centres such as Kiev, Leningrad, Odessa, Minsk, Stalingrad, Sevastopol, Smolensk, Novgorod, Orel, Kharkov, Voronezh, Rostov-on-Don, and Kursk were destroyed or extensively damaged. 32,000 industrial enterprises were demolished, as well as 98,000 collective farms, 1,876 state farms, 2,890 machine-and-tractor stations and 65,000 kilometres of railway track. Tens of thousands of hospitals, schools, colleges, research centres, theatres, libraries and cultural monuments were destroyed. Particularly heavy damage was sustained by the Ukrainian SSR, the Byelorussian SSR, large areas in the European part of the RSFSR, and the Baltic republics, which had been occupied by the Germans. The Soviet Union lost almost 30 per cent of its national wealth.**

The liberation struggles which developed during the war provided the prerequisites for democratic, socialist revolutions in a number of countries, enabling socialism to emerge beyond the boundaries of one country and creating the world socialist system. This victory loosened

---

* Cf. *Istoriya natsionalno-gosudarstvennogo stroitelstva v SSSR 1937-1972* (History of the National State Development in the USSR in 1937-1972), Vol. 2, p. 103.

** *Narodnoye khozyaistvo za 60 let* (Sixty Years of the Soviet National Economy), Moscow, 1977, p. 17.

still more the foundations of imperialism and anticipated the collapse of its colonial system.

THE ANTI-FASCIST RESISTANCE MOVEMENT

Fascist aggression and the regime of terror imposed by the nazis in the occupied countries caused both an intensification of popular opposition and a realignment of class forces. A broad anti-imperialist, anti-fascist front was formed.

The Soviet people's heroic struggle inspired the peoples in the occupied countries and territories to fight against the nazi invaders. Communist-led patriotic forces launched widespread anti-fascist activity. Many bourgeois regimes in Europe had completely compromised themselves by dooming their peoples to fascist slavery, had proved themselves incapable of resisting fascism. A part of the bourgeoisie continued their policy of national betrayal during the war too, usually acting in collusion with the nazi invaders.

In most occupied European countries a broad movement of resistance sprang up against the nazi invaders. The anti-fascist struggle assumed the form of a national liberation movement and also partly bore a revolutionary democratic character. Methods of struggle varied: members of the Resistance movement broke enemy weapons, evaded labour service, staged strikes, engaged in sabotage, gave armed resistance to the invaders, conducted guerilla warfare and organised revolts; patriots passed to the Allies valuable information about the disposition and strength of the German units, about air and naval bases, coastal defences, and troop movements. 'Soldiers from all continents who fought the armies of nazi Germany and militarist Japan, guerillas, Resistance members, underground anti-fascist forces, men and women who were forging victory in the rear,' read the Message of the CC CPSU, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government to the Peoples, Parliaments and Governments on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Soviet Union's victory in the Great Patriotic War, 'they were all ready to die in battle and did not spare themselves in defending their country, their ideals, their

homes and their families. They wanted to wipe out fascism and militarism once and for all and to save mankind forever from the horrors of war. They marched into the great battle hoping to win a lasting, just and democratic peace. Their heroic efforts have yielded fruit, and resulted in immense change. Social and political shifts of utmost significance have taken place, and for the first time in history, it is now objectively possibile to exclude war from the life of humanity.'*

Leonid Brezhnev emphasised that 'the courageous struggle sponsored by the Communists of the People's Liberation Army of Yugoslavia, the exploits of the armies and formations organised by the patriots of Poland, Czechoslovakia, the people's insurrections in Slovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, the liberation struggle of the Albanian people, the Resistance movement, the actions of the guerilla detachments in France, Italy and other countries, the struggle of the anti-fascist underground in the enemy camp—all this had in the long run merged with the struggle of the Soviet people into a single powerful torrent that had washed the brown dirt off the map of Europe.'**

The war in Poland was from its outset a just war of liberation. The struggle waged by the Polish people against the nazi occupation marked the beginning of Resistance in Europe. Under the guidance of the Polish Workers' Party, the Polish People's Guards were organised; in 1943 alone they carried out 323 combat operations against occupation troops and made 282 attacks on enemy trains.

In spite of the reign of terror, Czech patriots organised strikes, wrecking and sabotage on occupied territory. On the initiative of the Communist Party a Central National Revolutionary Committee was set up, which included representatives of the main Resistance groups. Julius Fučik, who superintended the publication of the underground newspaper *Rudé právo*, wrote in January 1942: 'We Communists love our people.... That is why we do not spare ourselves and are not afraid to make sacrifices

* *Kommunist*, No. 7, 1975, p. 4.

** L. I. Brezhnev, *Leninskim kursom* (Following Lenin's Course), Vol. 5, p. 255-56.

in the struggle for its ultimate liberation, to achieve a situation in which it, an equal among equals, will be able to live in freedom among the free peoples of the world.'* The struggle against the nazi invaders cost the lives of 25,000 Czechoslovak Communists or more than a third of the prewar Party membership.**

A broad guerilla movement developed in Bulgaria. On the initiative of the Bulgarian Workers' Party (BWP), a Patriotic Front was set up in 1942, uniting the BWP, the Agrarian People's Union, the 'Link' group, and other organisations. In March and April 1943 the Central Committee of the BWP united the guerilla detachments into a unified Popular Liberation Insurgent Army.

In Yugoslavia the Communist Party brought together all the nations and nationalities in militant comradeship and internationalist unity. The Central Committee of the Communist Party called on the people to fight the invaders. A General Staff of guerilla detachments was formed, headed by J. Broz Tito. All anti-fascist patriotic forces in the country were joined in the United Popular Liberation Front under the leadership of the working class. After the Communist-led insurrection of July 1941 in Serbia the struggle against the nazis developed into a popular war of liberation.

The invasion of Albania by Italian fascist troops in April 1939 marked the beginning of popular Resistance in that country. A guerilla movement developed within Albania, headed by the Albanian Communist Party, founded in 1941. In the summer of 1943 the National Liberation Army was formed.

A broad Resistance movement developed in France using slogans which revived the glorious traditions of the Great French Revolution and the Paris Commune. It was in France that popular struggles against the nazi invaders first came to be called the 'Resistance movement'. In France the Resistance began with calls to disobey the nazis, to engage in wrecking and sabotage, to stage boycotts and anti-fascist demonstrations, and terminated in an armed

* J. Fučik, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1955, p. 354 (in Russian).

** *Antivoyenniye traditsii mezhdunarodnogo rabochego dvizheniya* (International Working-Class Movement: Anti-Military Traditions), Moscow, 1972, p. 358.

struggle which reached its climax during the Paris insurrection of 1944.

This struggle was headed by the French Communist Party. In its Appeal to the People of France, issued on July 1940 and signed by the prominent leaders of the international labour and communist movement, Maurice Thorez and Jacques Duclos, the Party defined the concrete objectives, substance and chief methods of the liberation struggle. In its Declaration of May 15, 1941 the Central Committee of the French Communist Party urged the need for the formation of a National Front. 'Guided by the sole desire to achieve the unity of the nation for the sacred cause of national independence, the Communist Party, putting the interests of the country above all else, solemnly declares that, to bring about the formation of a broad front of national liberation, it is prepared to support every French government, every organisation and all men and women whose efforts tend in the direction of a genuine struggle against the national oppression to which France is subjected, and against the traitors who are in the service of the invaders.'* In 1943 the National Resistance Council was set up.

Thousands of people from the USSR and other countries took part in the French Resistance movement. Detachments of Soviet guerillas fought in almost all districts of France. In November 1944, the USSR Council of People's Commissars representative for the repatriation of Soviet citizens pointed out in his official statement that 'large number of Russians, Georgians, Armenians, Tajiks, Tatars, Ukrainians, Byelorussians—... Red Army soldiers and officers taken prisoner by the Germans and driven into French territory, revolted against the German Command and whole groups and units of them joined the French guerillas, playing an active combatant role in the liberation of France.'**

In June 1940 workers went on strike in Liège in Belgium and in September of that year there was a miners' strike at Borinage. Guerilla detachments, which

---

* *Moris Torez, Syn naroda* (Maurice Thorez, Son of the People), Moscow, 1960, pp. 167-68.

** *Pravda*, 11 November, 1944.

included escaped Soviet prisoners of war, were active in Belgian cities.

In Norway the Communist Party organised anti-fascist demonstrations and meetings in several cities in the autumn of 1940. Communist parties in other European countries also made determined efforts to organise national anti-fascist fronts.

In September 1941 a National Liberation Front was set up in Greece on the initiative of the Communist Party. It soon became a mass organisation. In December 1941 the Front organised the People's National Army of Liberation (ELAS), which united all guerilla detachments and had liberated two-thirds of mainland Greece by the summer of 1943. At that time ELAS was more than 70,000 strong.

Progressives in the axis countries also courageously fought against fascism. In an atmosphere of unprecedented chauvinism and racial intolerance German anti-fascists maintained the best internationalist traditions of the revolutionary movement. The German Communist Party numbered 300,000 when Hitler came to power. Of these 145,000 were thrown into prisons and prison camps by the nazis and more than 25,000 gave their lives in fighting to rid their country of nazism.* The Schulze-Boysen-Harnack underground group, a heroic element of the Resistance in Germany, is justifiably world famous. In spite of savage reprisals the German anti-fascists continually stepped up their opposition to the nazi regime. The Berlin organisation of the Communist Party of Germany alone had branches at thirty major enterprises in the capital,** and maintained close contact with Communist organisations in Saxony, Thuringia, Magdeburg, Hamburg, Dresden and elsewhere in Germany.

The 'Free Germany' National Committee (NFD), founded in July 1943, did a great deal to unite all progressive forces in Germany in the struggle against the nazi dictatorship. The NFD included people of different classes and sections of society (servicemen, army officers, politicians and trade unionists, writers and clergy) and of differ-

---

* *Antivoyenniye traditsii mezhdunarodnogo rabochego dvizheniya* (International Working-Class Movement: Anti-Military Traditions), p. 361.

** Cf. W. Ulbricht, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Zeit.* Bd. 1, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1955, S. 24.

ent political views, who had united to wipe out nazism.

In working to establish a broad national front in Germany, the Communists invariably strove for unity of action with foreign citizens in Germany, and above all with Soviet citizens. A notable role in the struggle against fascism was taken by the International Anti-Fascist Committee (IAK), founded by Soviet and German anti-fascists in the autumn of 1943. IAK maintained close contact with all POW camps attached to munitions factories at Leipzig and its environs, and with a prison camp in which captured Soviet officers were kept. 'This anti-fascist organisation set itself the task, above all, of uniting all foreign prisoners of war and the slave labour force to conduct an active anti-fascist struggle. In extraordinarily hard conditions it put into practice the ideas of proletarian internationalism and peoples' friendship.'*

A united front was set up by Italian anti-fascists in emigration. Under its influence inter-party bodies known as National Front committees arose in Italy. After 1942 there grew up a broad patriotic movement to have Italy withdraw from the war and sign a separate peace. Under the guidance of Communists, who regularly published the newspaper *Unita*, strikes against the war and fascism were staged at factories. Thanks to vigorous action by the working class and all working people, the Mussolini fascist regime fell. A substantial contribution to the common struggle against fascism was made by about 5,000 Soviet guerillas in the Italian Resistance. 'The Italian Resistance,' wrote Mauro Galleni, an Italian journalist, 'was undoubtedly proud to have these combatants in its ranks, men who gave everything without demanding anything for themselves.'**

A Patriotic Front which united diverse democratic organisations in a common struggle against fascism was set up in Romania early in 1943 on communist initiative. Among other things, its Programme contained demands for Romania's immediate withdrawal from the Axis and its attachment to the anti-fascist coalition.

---

* *Geschichte der Deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, Bd. 5, Berlin, 1966, S. 369.

** M. Galleni, *I partigiani sovietici nella Resistenza italiana*, Roma, 1967, p. 234.

The Hungarian Communist Party worked for Hungary's withdrawal from the aggressive bloc and its enlistment in the anti-Hitler coalition. In 1944 an underground Hungarian Front was founded which supported the establishment of an independent, free and democratic Hungary.

Unity and solidarity among all European peoples arose on the basis of the Resistance movement, which developed in all belligerent European countries. This feeling of solidarity among the peoples of the occupied countries grew stronger thanks to both the identity of political aims and the class solidarity of the masses, which were striving to achieve complete freedom from the fascist yoke.

The anti-fascist Resistance was essentially new in history. It was symbolic of the masses' passionate protest against the fascist ideology and the policy of cooperation with the foreign invaders, which was pursued by the collaborationist bourgeoisie.

It was a general democratic movement, uniting men and women of different social classes and political parties, of different ideological and political views, denominations and religious convictions; it became a part of the great war of liberation, waged by peoples firm in their antagonism to war, to fascism and its 'New Order'.

One characteristic feature of Resistance was its militant opposition to the domestic reactionaries who betrayed national interests and openly collaborated with the nazi occupation forces.

The leading and organising role in the Resistance movement was everywhere taken by the working class and its vanguard, the communist parties. This largely explains the fact that the aims of Resistance transcended the limits of the national liberation struggle, merging with the aims of social emancipation and acquiring a revolutionary dimension. The European working-class movement tended strongly towards unity; this was urged not only by Communists but also by Social-Democratic leaders.

Friedl Fürnberg, Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Austria, wrote: 'The strength of the diverse social forces of the people was, for the most part, directly dependent on the

measure of their active participation in the resistance to nazi rule. And it is precisely in this respect that the working class and the Communists were in the first ranks. It was so in France, Yugoslavia and Denmark, in Hungary and other countries under Hitlerite domination. It must be particularly stressed that heroism and readiness for self-sacrifice on the part of Soviet people and Communists were esteemed and honoured everywhere.'*

The resistance movement was remarkable for its international character: Frenchmen, Italians, Spaniards, Germans, Poles, Czechs, Greeks, Russians, Ukrainians and others fought fascism shoulder to shoulder in every occupied country. The ranks of the European Resistance included more than 400,000 Soviet citizens.

A Resistance movement developed in the enslaved Asian countries too: the peoples of China, Korea, Vietnam, Burma, the Philippines and Indonesia waged a determined struggle against Japanese aggression. Special armed forces—armies and guerilla detachments—were formed in Vietnam, Burma and the Philippines. Democratic reforms were carried out in areas liberated by the patriotic forces.

The Second World War directly involved vast numbers of people in almost every part of the world. In spite of chauvinist propaganda and savage punitive measures, different nations and nationalities formed a common oppositionist front which was simultaneously anticolonial. The forms and intensity of the struggle were determined by the concrete relation of class forces and the specific political and economic features of each conquered country. As the links between the home countries and their colonies and semi-colonies were broken and many were occupied by the German, Italian or Japanese imperialists, the peoples of the enslaved countries were drawn into a broad international movement to shake off their colonial fetters.

The six years of the Second World War, which ended in victory for the Soviet people and other progressive peace forces, made an indelible mark on the memory of mankind, leaving a lasting impression upon the being, views and actions of many hundreds of millions of men and women.

---

* *Kommunist*, No. 7, 1975, p. 67.

Chapter Five

DEVELOPED SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

> The emergence of a *new social and international historic community, the Soviet people*, is an important characteristic of developed socialism ... an indicator of the growing uniformity of Soviet society, and a triumph of the nationalities policy of the CPSU. It means that in this country common features are becoming paramount in the behaviour, character and world outlook of Soviet people.
>
> *L. I. Brezhnev*

Life began to change even more rapidly after the Second World War. Gradual, almost imperceptible quantitative changes were superseded by sweeping, revolutionary qualitative changes in different countries, areas and whole continents.

In the postwar period difficult tasks faced the Soviet people. Their internationalist and patriotic duty was now to eliminate the consequences of war, to switch the economy to peace-time production and to rehabilitate it.

The enemies of socialism thought that it would take the Soviet Union a very long time to recover from the immense losses and destruction it had sustained. Many bourgeois statesmen and economists estimated that the reconstruction would take decades; some of them surmised that the USSR could be written off as a great world power. The Soviet people upset these predictions.

Using the advantages of socialism and guided by the Communist Party, they accomplished yet another feat unprecedented in world history, that of rehabilitating and further developing the socialist national economy.

The international unity of the Soviet people, cemented by the ties of fraternal friendship, was decisive to successful postwar development. In 1944, when the war was still in progress the Soviet Government had set aside funds for the rehabilitation of the Ukrainian economy and the social and cultural establishments there. The 'Electrosila' factory in besieged Leningrad produced turbogenerators for the Ukraine. There is a machine in

the turbine room of the Donetsk metallurgical plant which has a plaque on it, reading: 'This 5,000-kilowatt turbogenerator was made in Leningrad during the blockade.'

A flood of goods trains, sea and river craft and lorries went from all corners of the country to the liberated towns and villages in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldavia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and the western part of the RSFSR, bringing steel, timber and machines for the rehabilitation of factories in Kharkov, Dnepropetrovsk, Kiev, Nikolayev, Lvov, Minsk, Bobruisk, Riga, Kishinev, Smolensk and elsewhere. Engineers, skilled workers, scientists and economists went from large industrial areas to help the Ukraine and other republics that had suffered under nazi occupation. To quote an example, the Zaporozhstal iron and steel works was rehabilitated by workers from 57 industrial establishments in other republics. The peoples of fraternal Soviet republics sent seeds, agricultural machinery and implements to the Ukraine and Byelorussia. Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism manifested itself in concrete action—by a joint effort the people won the war, rehabilitated the economy and built up the country.

The heroic story of the early years of postwar development in the USSR will long continue to interest scholars. Industry reached its prewar 1940 level of output as early as 1948, and agriculture reached that level in 1950, which provided the basis for further advance on a scale and at a rate greatly surpassing the prewar years.

The rapid postwar development of the Soviet Union proved in practice that genuine social progress, unprecedented in the history of any people or during any epoch, was inextricably linked to socialism.

The Leninist Party united the working class, the toiling peasants and the people's intelligentsia in the effort to overcome the onerous legacy of war and nazi occupation and to ensure a further improvement in the life of the country. It was not simply economic growth, but the growth of the productive forces and the culture of socialist society free from the fetters of exploitation and class antagonisms. The foundations of socialism—the abolition of the exploiting classes and the establishment of public ownership of the means of production in every

sector of the economy—had been laid in the Soviet Union by the late 1930s. But the new society was then in its infancy and the conditions for the immediate transition to communism were not then present. Before this certain stages in the development of socialism on its own basis must be traversed. Moreover, practice has shown that the development, the perfecting of socialism is a task no less complex, no less responsible than the laying of its foundations.'*

It is less than 35 years since the end of the war; over that time the Soviet Union has become a society of developed, mature socialism, one of the strongest industrial powers in the world. A mature socialist society must rest on highly developed productive forces, on powerful advanced industry, on large-scale, highly mechanised agriculture based on collectivist principles—this, in terms of scale and technological standards, describes the contemporary Soviet economy.

Compared with the prewar level, the Soviet gross social product has increased 18-fold, the amount of available power per worker in industry nearly 8-fold, and in agriculture more than 15-fold. It is impossible to imagine the modern Soviet economy without energy produced by atomic power plants, without electronics or the production of computers and semiconductor materials—indeed, without many other industries which did not exist here before the war. In the general volume of industrial production, the share of those industries essential to the technological progress and efficiency of the national economy has more than trebled.

This has not been mere quantitative growth. There has simultaneously been a qualitative change in industry, transport, communications, in the entire national economy. Production methods altered, and technology was raised to a higher level. Branches of production which were developed to play a leading role were: construction of automated mechanisms, instrument making, modern machine-tool manufacture, electronics, high-grade metallurgy, the chemical industry, new power

* L. I. Brezhnev, 'A Historic Stage on the Road to Communism', *World Marxist Review*, December 1977, p. 4.

industries (oil, gas, mammoth hydro- and thermal power stations, nuclear reactors), computational technique and cybernetics, space technology, and oceanology. Electric traction and modern diesel engines were used on the railways. There were major changes in the material and technical supplies for agriculture.

Scientific and technical progress entered various spheres of life. People of a new mold, adept in the new technology and management methods, came to the fore. Extremely complex problems in the spheres of science, technology and production were definitively solved, often for the first time in history.

Soviet scientists, engineers and technicians were pioneers in the practical utilisation of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The world's first atomic power station came into operation in June 1954 not far from Moscow. The largest nuclear reactor in the world was constructed in the Soviet Union. The first artificial earth satellite was launched in the Soviet Union in 1957, and in April 1961 the spaceship piloted by Yuri Gagarin, a Soviet citizen, took off from the Baikonur spaceport in Kazakhstan. In the postwar period the Soviet people successfully carried out Lenin's behest to prove 'to all and sundry that socialism contains within itself gigantic forces and that mankind has now entered into a new stage of development of extraordinary brilliant prospects'.*

In the initial stages of the building of socialism the Soviet people had to concentrate their resources and efforts on first-priority tasks; the very existence of the Soviet state depended on the solution of these problems. Under developed socialism, taking advantage of the continuous growth of the economy and the joining of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist organisation of society, it became possible increasingly to satisfy the material and cultural requirements of the people. The CPSU and the state now could increasingly concentrate their funds and efforts to improve the well-being of the working people and promote the service industry.

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Better Fewer, But Better', *op. cit.*, Vol. 33, p. 498.

Soviet experience shows that under socialism the immense material resources available to society are, in the long run, used to satisfy the vital needs of the masses. The real income of the Soviet population was 5.1 times greater in 1976 than in 1940.* The social consumption funds** guarantee Soviet citizens free primary, secondary and further education, free medical treatment, pensions, scholarship grants, holidays with pay, free or reduced-rate passes to sanatoria and holiday homes, nursery schools for their children and also other allowances and benefits. Between 1971 and 1975 the average monthly cash earnings of factory, professional and office workers increased by 20 per cent, bringing monthly wages to an average of 146 roubles, but with the allowances and benefits paid from the social consumption funds average earnings were as high as 198 roubles. The remuneration rates paid to collective farmers increased by 25 per cent. Retirement and disability pensions for factory, professional and office workers, collective farmers and servicemen increased, as did scholarship grants for college and technical school students. 'Real per capita income in our country has doubled roughly every 15 years,' A. N. Kosygin told the 25th Party Congress. 'In other words, in the course of a man's life-span, socialist society moves to a qualitatively new stage of consumption several times.'***

The Soviet Union holds one of the leading places in the world in total volume of house construction. Between 1971 and 1975 more than eleven million flats and private houses were built, with an aggregate floor space of 544.8 million square metres.**** Rents have not risen since 1928, and do not exceed 3 per cent of the income of a worker's

---

* See *SSSR v tsifrakh v 1976 godu* (USSR in Figures, 1976), Moscow, 1977, p. 192.

** The social consumption funds are a part of national income set aside to meet certain needs of the members of socialist society, free of charge or on privileged terms. The funds are expended on education, health, social insurance, and allowances for mothers of large families and unmarried mothers.

*** *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1976, p. 118.

**** *SSSR v tsifrakh v 1976 godu.* (USSR in Figures, 1976), p. 196.

family. In the bourgeois Western countries, where rent can be up to 20 per cent of the family budget, where higher or specialised education can cost a lot of money, and where one may pay several hundred dollars, if not more, for an operation, the genuine benefits that real socialism has assured to the people are practically unattainable.

There has been a substantial increase in the overall cultural and educational standards of Soviet citizens, the most well-read people in the world. The higher and specialised secondary schools of the Soviet Union currently have an enrolment of about ten million, or over seven times more than before the war; universal secondary education has, in the main, been achieved. In 1977 the number of Soviet citizens with at least a secondary education (lasting eight or ten years) amounted to 126.1 million and 73.2 per cent of factory workers have higher or secondary education, complete or incomplete.

Profound changes have also occurred in the social structure of Soviet society. The Soviet working class, which is the society's leading force, is today 70 million strong, and comprises two-thirds of the gainfully employed population, as against one-third before the war. The workers social rate, political maturity and participation in the management of the state is growing steadily. The proportion of workers among Soviet deputies at all levels is more than 42 per cent, a fivefold increase on 1936.

In the period of developed socialism and under the impact of the scientific and technical revolution a new type of worker is developing, in whose activities physical and mental work are ever more harmoniously combined.

The collective-farm peasantry has also changed a good deal. Its social status draws increasingly closer to that of the working class, while its educational standard and life style are little different from urban standards. The modern farmer, born and raised under Soviet rule, possesses a collectivist mentality, ideological commitment, and dedication to the cause of socialism and communism.

The Soviet intellectuals, recruited mostly from the workers and peasants, devote all their creative energies to building the new society. They are the most rapidly growing group of Soviet working people. Since 1936 the

number of graduate experts in industry has increased 34 times and in agriculture 47 times. The Soviet Union has almost 1.3 million scientists—a quarter of the world's total.

Convergence of the different forms of socialist property, the gradual obliteration of the difference between town and country and between mental and physical work, and the adoption of the ideological and political views of the working class by all working people have resulted in the convergence of the interests and goals, the social ideals and psychology of all sections of society. On this basis the political system of society has also undergone a substantial change. The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat has developed into a socialist state of the whole people.

All these objective processes in the development of Soviet society make it possible to conclude that a developed socialist society has been built in the USSR.

'It is a society in which powerful productive forces and progressive science and culture have been created, in which the well-being of the people is constantly rising, and more and more favourable conditions are being provided for the all-round development of the individual.

'It is a society of mature socialist social relations, in which, on the basis of the drawing together of all classes and social strata and of the juridical and factual equality of all its nations and nationalities and their fraternal cooperation, a new historical community of people has been formed—the Soviet people.

'It is a society of high organisational capacity, ideological commitment, and consciousness of the working people, who are patriots and internationalists.

'It is a society in which the law of life is concern of all for the good of each and concern of each for the good of all.

'It is a society of true democracy, the political system of which ensures effective management of all public affairs, ever more active participation of the working people in running the state, and the combining of citizens' real rights and freedoms with their duties and responsibility to society.

'Developed socialist society is a natural, logical stage on the road to communism.'*

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF REAL EQUALITY AMONG THE SOVIET NATIONS AND NATIONALITIES

In the period of the building of socialism the solution to the nationalities question was approached initially by abolishing the economic lag of the national republics and regions, organising a system of education in the local languages, establishing national cultural institutions, and in surmounting discord and suspicion between peoples. When all these problems were solved the achievement of economic and cultural equality of nations, of real equality, became possible.

Russians and Ukrainians, Uzbeks and Kazakhs, Byelorussians and Azerbaijanians, Georgians and Armenians, Bashkirs and Yakuts, Turkmens and Kirghizes, Tajiks and Karelians, and those who embarked on the socialist path somewhat later—Latvians, Lithuanians, Moldavians, Estonians and the inhabitants of the Western parts of the Ukraine and Byelorussia—indeed, all Soviet toilers, were simultaneously the creators and the witnesses of the stupendous changes that occurred throughout the country, from the Danube and Vistula to the Pacific and Arctic oceans, from the Caucasus and Pamirs to the Far North.

'The unity of the nations and their mutual assistance,' said Leonid Brezhnev, 'accelerated the development of all the republics at unprecedented rates. Hostility and mistrust in the relations between nations gave way to friendship and mutual respect. Internationalism was firmly established in place of the psychology of national arrogance that had been implanted for ages. Mutually enriched national cultures, forming an integral Soviet socialist culture, shone forth with fresh, vivid colours.'**

---

* *The Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR*, Moscow, 1977, pp. 13-14.

** L. I. Brezhnev, *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress*, Moscow, 1977, p. 9.

The imposing Leninist plan for the regeneration and advance of all Soviet nations and nationalities, whether big or small, backward or advanced, has been put into practice. The notion of a backward ethnic borderland, so common in the Russian Empire, has ceased to exist. The toiling masses of the former borderlands have caught up with Central Russia and, over the same historical period, have attained the heights of socialist civilisation. The foundations for this were laid in the prewar period, but the most important achievements have taken place in the postwar years.

Let us take as an example the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan. In 1940 the industrial output of the Kazakh SSR increased 7.8-fold over that of 1913, and in 1976 it increased 214-fold. In the Kirghiz SSR, industrial output increased respectively 9.9 and 301-fold, and in the Tajik SSR, 8.8 and 125-fold.* In 1975 gross agricultural output increased 5.67-fold in Kazakhstan, 9-fold in Tajikistan, 6.55-fold in Kirghizia, 6.42-fold in Uzbekistan, and 6.11-fold in Turkmenia, compared with the pre-revolutionary level.**

The extremely widespread illiteracy and semi-literacy that existed in the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan is a thing of the past. In terms of gainfully employed persons with a higher or secondary education (complete or incomplete), the Central Asian republics are at the All-Union level. The latter is 76.7 per cent, the corresponding figures are 77 per cent in Kazakhstan, 77.9 per cent in Uzbekistan, 79.5 per cent in Turkmenia, 76.3 per cent in Kirghizia, and 73.7 per cent in Tajikistan.***

There has been an unprecedented leap in the socio-economic and cultural development of Kazakhstan. Industrialisation, virgin land development and the organisation of state farms—factories turning out grain and animal products—have transformed this republic from

---

* *SSSR v tsifrakh v 1976 godu* (USSR in Figures, 1976), p. 98.

** *Narodnoye khozyaistvo SSSR v 1975 godu* (Soviet National Economy in 1975), Moscow, 1976, p. 314 (in Russian).

*** *Op. cit.*, p. 554. Similar indicators are found in all the Union and Autonomous republics, national regions and areas except the Lithuanian SSR (63.7 per cent) and the Moldavian SSR (65.6 per cent) which joined the USSR later than the rest.

the wilderness that it once was. In 1975 Kazakhstan came third (after the RSFSR and the Ukraine) in grain output.

Kazakhstan, like Siberia and the Urals, was one of the main sites to which industry was moved from the central parts of the country during the last war. The Karaganda coal and ore basin played a great role in securing the Soviet victory in the Great Patriotic War. The development of virgin land in Kazakhstan was a romantic and heroic phase in the history of the Soviet Union. The example of the Kazakh SSR fully bears out Lenin's words about the immense progressive significance of rapid economic development in the ethnic regions and the abolition of national isolation and the importance of increased intercourse, cooperation, and fellowship between working people of different nationalities, whose life-style breaks down national barriers, affirming proletarian, socialist internationalism.

The Tajik people, one of the most ancient in the USSR, doomed to physical extinction under tsarism, is now flourishing. Working people there are today faced by a tremendous task, that of developing the South Tajik territorial production complex, which depends for its power upon the Nurek hydroelectric power station. The construction of the still larger Rogun hydroelectric power station has begun; the chemical industry is growing rapidly; large areas of fallow land are being brought under cultivation. These changes are transforming the face of the republic and its economic pattern.

Every Union republic long ago moved from the situation it was in immediately after 1917. The Transcaucasian republics—Georgia, Azerbaijan (except the Baku district) and Armenia—had nothing but small artisan industries at the time the USSR was formed. Backwardness based on exploitation fettered the rich ancient culture of those Transcaucasian peoples. Today, however, they are highly-developed industrial-agrarian republics, centres of the chemical and petrochemical industries and chemical engineering, where large, modern and nationally famous metallurgical, pipe-rolling and engineering plants, and factories producing electric locomotives, cars, motor boats, computers, instruments, electronic and radio-engineering appliances are in full

operation. Great successes have been achieved in subtropical agriculture. The deep-rooted culture and art of the peoples of this region have been developed and enriched. The eminent achievements of the scientists and cultural figures of these republics are known not only in the Soviet Union but also throughout the world.

The Byelorussian SSR, which suffered particularly during the war, rose like a phoenix from the ashes. Towns and villages were rebuilt, and major industrial projects launched. Today the republic produces computers, heavy-duty lorries, tractors, radio equipment, mineral fertiliser, and synthetic fibre. In 1975 Byelorussian farmers harvested an average of up to 20 metric centners of grain per hectare, as against 8 in 1940 and 7.1 in 1913. The republic, known for its internationalist traditions, has a large force of scientists and workers in the arts.

Moldavia too, long oppressed by the Romanian boyars, was until recently a backward area. Now united with the other working people of the USSR, this republic has become one of the country's major grain-producing, fruit-growing and agricultural centres. It is successfully carrying out an important socio-political experiment, building large integrated complexes and amalgamations of an agrarian and agrarian-industrial type (integrating state farms, collective farms and industrial establishments). Moldavia's experience is being broadly applied in other republics.

Thus, the formerly backward ethnic borderlands have turned into advanced socialist Union and Autonomous republics, holding a creditable place in the fraternal family of Soviet peoples. The inequality of these areas has been wiped out.

The republics and regions which were previously at a comparatively high level of economic development have also far surpassed their prewar position, not to mention their pre-revolutionary standards. As a member of the community of Soviet republics and, above all, in a close fraternal alliance with the Russian working class and people, the Ukrainian workers, peasants and intellectuals have been able to exercise their rich potential. The Donets Basin, Zaporozhye, Kharkov, Dnepropetrovsk, the Kherson area, Odessa, the Transcarpathian area and many

other regions of the Ukraine have entirely changed, becoming centres of high material and moral culture. Modern Ukrainian industry, developing as part of the single Soviet national economic complex, has grown 89-fold under Soviet rule, despite the appalling devastation to which it was subject during both the Civil War and the Great Patriotic War. Today the Soviet Ukraine encompasses a prodigious iron and steel industry, diversified engineering, shipbuilding, highly developed chemical, food and light industries, wonderful scientific, cultural and artistic centres, and a large-scale highly-mechanised system of agriculture.

The RSFSR is the largest of the Union republics. In 1976 its industrial output was 137 times that in 1913, which coincides with the country's overall rate of growth.

Along with Moscow, Leningrad, Gorky, Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk, Kuibyshev, Kazan, Volgograd, Voronezh and other large cities of the RSFSR which are enjoying their second youth, hundreds of new towns and industrial centres have emerged in the European and Asiatic parts of the Russian Federation. The RSFSR not only sets an example in the rapid development of its socialist economy, science, culture, and education, but also continues to be the mainstay of the advance of Soviet society. There are 16 Autonomous republics, five Autonomous regions, and ten Autonomous areas in the RSFSR.

Development of the productive forces after the war was particularly rapid in the east and south-east of the RSFSR. The discovery and commercial exploitation of the natural resources in the eastern regions, where many nations and nationalities live, is, under developed socialism, a most potent factor in the international consolidation of socialist nations, nationalities and ethnic groups. Developed socialism has raised all peoples, both big and small, to the heights of modern civilisation, putting them in possession of an advanced socialist culture and thus expediting the way for the solution of the task—that of development of the vast sources of power and raw materials of Soviet Siberia, which is a tremendously important issue for all mankind.

Continuing on the course begun during the prewar five-year plans, the Soviet people today is opening up its

eastern storehouse, which will entail a real revolution in the life of this rich, multinational area, in both material production and relations between the Soviet peoples living there.

One vivid instance of the changes that socialism has brought to formerly backward peoples is the history of the Bashkirian people. Before the October Revolution Bashkiria was a remote and backward area with no industry at all. The Bashkirs received their statehood in March 1919, when the Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was set up within the RSFSR. The land seized by the tsarist government and landlords was made over to the Bashkirian people, who have now experienced at first hand the benefits of the thorough social and economic reforms effected under Soviet Government. The Bashkir ASSR is a rich industrial-agrarian republic producing oil, gas, coal, modern machine-tools, oil equipment, construction materials, textiles and processed foodstuffs. The chemical industry has rapidly developed there since the war. Workers, engineers and technicians from major chemical plants in the socialist countries go there to accumulate work-experience. Presently Ufa, the capital of Bashkiria, with its population of 942,000, has a university, several colleges and technical schools, dozens of theatres and cinemas, a branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences, several research centres, and numerous general educational schools and libraries.

The superiority of the Soviet socialist system has also been proved by the experience of the Baltic republics—Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. Having rid themselves of capitalism and embarked on the socialist path of development, these republics have exhibited very high rates of industrial growth. In 1975 the volume of industrial output in Lithuania was 46 times that of 1940, and in Latvia and Estonia it was 38 times greater. The yield of grain crops per hectare increased from 9.4 metric centners in 1940 to 20 metric centners in 1975 in Lithuania, from 12.1 to 19.3 metric centners in Latvia, and from 11.5 to 26.7 metric centners in Estonia.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet state consider relations between nationalities to be a key aspect of the life of socialist society. As early as 1921

the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party considered the situation in various parts of the country and agreed on the best methods of development for each people. In today's changed historical situation all national features are considered in close association with social and economic processes, which do not, after all, develop in the same way everywhere nor according to some preconceived plan. Lenin's methodology is of decisive importance to this day; he insisted on placing every nationality issue in a concrete historic framework, taking into account the specific features differentiating the given republic, region or district from the others within the one Soviet socialist state.

Carrying these postulates further with reference to the contemporary situation, Leonid Brezhnev said: 'There are also objective problems in our federal state, such as finding the most correct ways of developing the individual nations and nationalities and the most correct balance between the interests of each nation and nationality and the common interests of the Soviet people as a whole. In dealing with these problems, our Party closely follows Lenin's injunction that the maximum concern be shown for the development and interests of each nation.'*

The national question, a legacy of the past, has been solved completely, finally and irrevocably in the Soviet Union. This achievement of the Soviet people can rightly be put on a par with such attainments as industrialisation, collectivisation and the cultural revolution.

A great community of working people united, regardless of nationality, by the identity of their class interests and aims, has been firmly established in the Soviet Union, and unprecedented relations have developed which Soviet people rightly describe as the Leninist friendship of peoples. This friendship is one of the most substantial gains of socialism.

Today, under developed socialism, together with the achievement of the real economic and cultural equality of the republics and the enhancement of friendship among peoples, the following issues are of prime importance: the growing contribution of each republic to the common

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, pp. 76-77.

cause of building communism, the further convergence of nations and the development of manifold and equal fraternal cooperation between the nations.

THE INTERNATIONAL UNITY OF THE SOVIET PEOPLES

The developed socialist society has at its disposal the socio-economic and moral prerequisites to enable the peoples to draw ever more closely together and to achieve a *qualitatively new stage* in their fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance. We are speaking not only of friendship among peoples but also of the unshakeable international unity of all Soviet peoples.

The consolidation and growth of the international unity of peoples are furthered by the principles of the Soviet state system and by improvements in the system of relations between Union and republican bodies. The internationalism of the Soviet state system finds graphic expression in democratic centralism and socialist federalism, which reflect the identity of the fundamental aims and tasks of the Soviet people as a whole, the uniform objective laws governing both the building of communism and the distinctive character of this process in the individual republics.

The internationalist principles on which the brotherhood of the Soviet peoples rests have been embodied and developed in the new Soviet Constitution adopted in 1977.

This Constitution not only preserves the former sovereign rights of the Union republics but adds some new ones, with new guarantees. It contains, for instance, the right of Union republics to share the decision-making in matters that come within the jurisdiction of the USSR, and establishes their right to initiate laws in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR through their highest bodies of state authority.

Comparing Article 70 of the 1977 Constitution with Article 13 of the previous Constitution of 1936, we see that, whereas Article 13 states that the USSR 'is a federal state, formed on the basis of a voluntary union of equal Soviet Socialist Republics', Article 70 of the 1977 Constitution describes the USSR as an 'integral, federal, multina-

tional state formed on the principle of socialist federalism as a result of the free self-determination of nations and the voluntary association of equal Soviet Socialist Republics'.

This clearly reflects the Leninist principles of democratic centralism and the idea of the self-determination of nations; both have played an immense role in the building of the Soviet multinational state, and their implementation helps to consolidate the unity of Union and national statehood and to expand the areas of social relations in which Union and republican bodies operate jointly.

International unity under developed socialism is based on the extension of economic ties between republics, the rising effectiveness of the territorial division of labour, and the steady growth and convergence of the socialist nations. The single Soviet economic organism forms the durable material foundation of friendship and cooperation between peoples, while the economic relations of each socialist nation and nationality are an integral part of the Soviet socialist economy. Accordingly, all social classes and groups and all Soviet nations and nationalities are inseparably linked within Soviet society, making an aggregate contribution which can and does give society immeasurably more than any isolated efforts could. As a result, today's consolidation processes and their regularities, implicit in socialist internationalism, are powerful indeed.

In Soviet society the boundaries of Union and Autonomous republics do not divide but unite the working people of different socialist nations and nationalities, and are a prime example of the practical implementation of the Leninist principle of friendship and brotherhood between peoples. The plans for current and long-term economic development in the Soviet Union, in each republic, region and territory, help to bring the working people of the entire country together into a single family. These plans concentrate each nation mainly on the fullest possible utilisation of the material and moral potential, on the development of specialisation and cooperation and on raising the efficiency of the territorial division of labour within the framework of the integral economic mechanism of the USSR.

Only the existence of a large-scale centralised national economy which unites the material resources of all the republics has enabled the Soviet peoples to achieve their unprecedented success in the building of socialism. The Soviet economic system makes it possible to distribute productive forces rationally, ensuring freedom in economic manoeuvring, and enabling the extension of cooperation and specialisation. The result is a net gain much higher than the simple sum of the individual efforts of each republic, district and region.

Such projects as the construction of big territorial production complexes like the Sayano-Shushenskaya hydroelectric power station, the Kama automobile plant, the Baikal-Amur railway, the West Siberian, Angara-Yenisei and South Tajik complexes and the vigorous development of agriculture in the non-black soil zone of the RSFSR, are being tackled jointly by the working people of all the republics, territories and regions of the Soviet Union. And the future will see the growth of still larger complexes, particularly in connection with the Baikal-Amur railway. All this involves growing coordination on an all-Union scale, improvement of horizontal and vertical cooperation and planning in industry and agriculture, and even closer collaboration between the USSR Academy and the republican academies of sciences. Leonid Brezhnev has stated that the long-term programmes of the economic development of the USSR 'are designed to meet the country's future requirements in oil, gas, coal, ferrous and nonferrous metals, timber and other raw materials. There is great social significance too in the implementation of these programmes. It will mean the development of many remote regions of the country, where dozens of new towns will be built and new cultural centres established. The very idea of "undeveloped outskirts" will disappear completely.'*

The growing concentration and centralisation of socialist production, greater automation of control systems, and computerisation, lead to the improvement of production relations in developed socialist society and to a greater internationalisation of its material and intellectual life.

* L. I. Brezhnev, *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress*, p. 15.

The internationalisation of the Soviet economy is exemplified by a decision made by the CC CPSU in 1976 on the further specialisation and concentration of farm production on the basis of inter-farm cooperation and agrarian-industrial integration. The Decision is permeated with the spirit of internationalism, as it is based on the experience of many thousands of inter-farm specialised amalgamations, organisations and enterprises in the Moldavian, Byelorussian and Ukrainian republics, the Krasnodar Territory, the Mari ASSR, the Voronezh and Penza regions and elsewhere.

The Decision points out the need for a differential approach to the development of various economic areas and outlines the stages of mixed cooperation between collective and state farms and industrial enterprises. The first stage is the establishment of large specialised inter-collective-farm, collective and state farm and other state-cum-collective farm enterprises and of industrial-type amalgamations specialising, for instance, in the production of meat, milk, eggs, seeds, vegetables, wool, mixed and other types of feeds, in stock breeding, horticulture and storage and primary processing of produce. Such development facilitates further agrarian-industrial integration and the fusion of agriculture with industry, eventually leading to the establishment of a wide network of agricultural-industrial enterprises and amalgamations. In time this will bring about the convergence of public property with the property of collective-farms and cooperatives and their ultimate fusion into the property of the whole people. The production alliance between town and country, based on the fraternal community of the workers and peasants—which was so fruitful earlier in the building of socialism—eventually develops into a higher form of economic cooperation between agriculture and industry. The gradual eradication of the distinctions between town and country and between mental and physical work is a characteristic feature of the convergence of the socialist nations and nationalities.

Obsolete methods are discarded as new branches of industry and power engineering and new means of communication are developed, as agriculture is mecha-

nised and the latest results of the scientific and technological revolution are applied. Local and national self-isolation, once a dominant factor, is superseded by increasingly close and extensive contact, and wide-range interdependence between the socialist nations and nationalities.

National isolation and exclusiveness begin to crumble even under capitalism, but this process can only be completed in socialist society, where it develops on a fundamentally different social, economic, ideological, political and cultural basis, accelerating social progress.

Productive forces are today becoming more internationalised in both the socialist and the capitalist world. But the laws of the capitalist mode of production sustain social inequality, perpetually extending the polarisation between the few industrialised states and the majority of countries, which are still underdeveloped. Conversely, the laws to which socialism is subject demand an equalisation of economic levels, a rational location of the productive forces, and the siting of industry as near the sources of raw material and energy as possible. 'The appearance of new industrial centres, the prospecting and development of mineral deposits, virgin land development, and the growth of all modes of transport,' the Programme of the CPSU states, 'increase the mobility of the population and promote greater intercourse between the peoples of the Soviet Union. People of many nationalities live together and work in harmony in the Soviet Republics. The boundaries between the Union republics of the USSR are increasingly losing their former significance, since all the nations are equal, their life is based on a common socialist foundation, the material and spiritual needs of every people are satisfied to the same extent, and they are all united in a single family by common vital interests and are advancing together to the common goal—communism.'*

The internationalisation of the life of Soviet republics lends increasing significance to the growth of inter-nation intercourse and mutual assistance and to the increasingly

---

* *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1962, p. 559.

extensive exchanges of personnel and of material and moral values.

The convergence of nations steadily grows and extends to the economic, social, political and cultural spheres, influencing life at home and at work. Mobility between republics increases: in eleven of the fifteen republics more than a quarter of the population does not belong to the eponymous nationalities.

We shall quote some statistical data on the national composition of the individual republics, according to the 1970 census.* There were in the Kazakh SSR 4.2 million Kazakhs (32.6 per cent of the total population), 5.5 million Russians (42.4 per cent), 0.93 million Ukrainians (7.2 per cent), 0.28 million Tatars (2.2 per cent), 0.21 million Uzbeks (1.7 per cent), and about 0.2 million Byelorussians (1.5 per cent). The Kazakh SSR had a very large proportion of other national groups (Uigurs, Koreans, Dzungarians and others), coming second to the RSFSR in this respect. These groups accounted for over two per cent of the republic's population. The Kazakh Republic is one of the most multinational republics of the Soviet Union.

The Uzbek SSR had a population of 11.8 million, of whom 7.7 million or 65.5 per cent of the total were Uzbeks. There were 1.5 million Russians (12.5 per cent of the total). The other national groups included Tatars (4.9 per cent), Karakalpaks (2 per cent), Koreans (1.3 per cent), Ukrainians (0.9 per cent), Kirghizes (0.9 per cent), Jews (0.9 per cent), Kazakhs (4 per cent) and Tajiks (3.8 per cent).

The Kirghiz SSR had a population of 2.93 million, of which the Kirghizes accounted for 1.28 million or 43.8 per cent of the total, Russians accounted for 0.856 million or 29.2 per cent, Uzbeks, for 0.333 million or 11.3 per cent, and Ukrainians, for 0.12 million or 4.1 per cent of the total. The other national groups included Tatars, Uigurs, Kazakhs, Tajiks and Dzungarians; the republic contains more than 70 nationalities.

In the Tajik SSR there were 1.6 million Tajiks or 56.2

---

* The figures are cited from *Itogi Vsesoyuznoi perepisi naseleniya 1970 goda.* (Results of the 1970 All-Union Census), Vol. IV.

per cent of the republic's total population. Uzbeks accounted for about a quarter of the population (0.7 million or 23 per cent). There were 0.34 million Russians in the republic, or 11.9 per cent of its total population. Tatars, Kirghizes and Ukrainians were the three other large ethnic groups (2.4, 1.2 and 1.1 per cent of the total respectively).

The Turkmenian SSR was inhabited by 1.42 million Turkmens or 65.6 per cent of the total. There were also 0.31 million Russians (14.5 per cent), 0.18 million Uzbeks (8.3 per cent). Kazakhs, Ukrainians, Tatars and Armenians accounted respectively for 3.2, 1.6, 1.7 and 1.1 per cent of the total.

There is a particularly notable admixture of nationalities in towns and cities, the main centres of industry, transport and construction. For instance, the population of the capital of the Turkmenian SSR, Ashkhabad, is comprised of over 50 nationalities; Dushanbe, the capital of Tajikistan, is inhabited by about 70 nationalities; Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan, by more than 80 nationalities.

The population is usually multinational in other Soviet republics. In the Ukraine in 1970, for example, the population was three-quarters Ukrainian and about one-fifth Russian. Jews, Byelorussians, Poles, Moldavians and others comprised about 6 per cent of the population. In Byelorussia four-fifths of the population was Byelorussian, ten per cent was Russian, and the rest were Poles, Ukrainians, Jews and others.

The population of the Transcaucasian republics is also ethnically heterogeneous. In the Georgian SSR, Georgians accounted for 66.8 per cent (3.1 million) of the total population of the republic, Armenians for 9.7, Russians for 8.5, Azerbaijanians for 4.6, Ossets for 3.2, and Kurds for 4 per cent of the total. Villages in Georgia are usually mononational. The towns—particularly Kutaisi, Rustavi and Chiaturi—have a mixed multinational population with a large number of migrant workers from the RSFSR and other fraternal republics.

In the Azerbaijanian SSR the population has been growing rapidly over the past few decades: in 1970 it was 5.1 million, as against 3.7 million in 1959. This growth is

mainly due to an increase in the number of Azerbaijanians (1.29 million over the period indicated). Azerbaijanians accounted for 73.8 per cent of the republic's population, Russians for 10 per cent and Armenians for 9.4 per cent. Other ethnic groups comprised the remaining 6.8 per cent.

In the Armenian SSR Armenians accounted for 88.6 per cent of the population. The other ethnic groups were comparatively small: Azerbaijanians—5.9 per cent, Russians—2.7, Kurds—1.5, and others—1.3 per cent of the total. It is worth noting that the proportion of Russian-speaking Armenians was fairly large (23.5 per cent).

A comparison of 1939 and 1959 census data shows that during and after the war the proportion of the indigenous population in some Autonomous republics fell slightly. For example, Buryats accounted for 20.2 per cent of the total population of the Buryat ASSR in 1959, as against 21.3 per cent in 1939. Similarly, the proportion of indigenous population dropped from 49.6 to 35.1 per cent in the Kalmyk ASSR, from 23.2 to 13.1 per cent in the Karelian ASSR, from 72 to 30.4 per cent in the Komi ASSR, from 47.1 to 43.1 per cent in the Mari ASSR, from 48.7 to 47.2 in the Tatar ASSR, from 39.2 to 35.6 per cent in the Udmurt ASSR, and from 72.1 to 70.2 per cent in the Chuvash ASSR. In all these republics there was a considerable increase in the absolute size of the indigenous population which was, however, coincident with an influx of people of other nationalities, mainly Russians.

Simultaneously, a considerable proportion of people moved away from the home republics. For example, according to the 1959 census, 72.1 per cent of the Mordvinians lived in other regions of the RSFSR and other Union republics, while only 27.9 per cent of them resided in the Mordovian ASSR, since Mordovia is a primarily agrarian republic and industrialisation of the Soviet national economy has encouraged some Mordvinians to migrate to other parts of the country. A sizeable proportion of Tatars, Chuvashes, Mari and other peoples also reside in places other than their own autonomous republics.*

* A. A. Yusupov, *Natsionalni sostav naseleniya SSSR (po itogam perepisi 1959 g.)* (The National Composition of the Population of the USSR according to the results of the 1959 census), Moscow, 1964.

The Baltic republics and western regions of Byelorussia and the Ukraine, which joined the USSR shortly before the Great Patriotic War and fell under nazi occupation, subsequently went through a complex period of transition and rehabilitation and have since made rapid headway in economy, science and culture. Nevertheless, the influence of the relatively recent past still makes itself felt there at times and external pressures (among other things, from fairly large emigre and kinship groups abroad) also exert a negative influence.

Drawing his conclusions from sociological research conducted in the Baltic area, mainly in the Latvian SSR, A. I. Kholmogorov writes: 'In educating the working people of Latvia in an internationalist spirit we face particular issues and, above all, the fact that during bourgeois rule there a considerable proportion of the working people, the middle-aged and especially the elderly, were influenced by bourgeois nationalist ideology and policy. Nationalism as an official doctrine and policy was actively spread in bourgeois Latvia for twenty years. Under nazi occupation the German racists and Latvian bourgeois nationalists continued to infect people's minds with bourgeois nationalism while also spreading the nationalist conceptions of "national superiority", a "uniform national stream", and "natural Lettish individualism"'.*

Turning to the national composition of the population of the Baltic republics, according to the 1970 census, we see that in Lithuania there were 2.5 million Lithuanians or 80.1 per cent of the total population of the republic, 0.268 million Russians (8.6 per cent) and 0.024 million Poles (7.7 per cent). There were also fairly large groups of Byelorussians (1.5 per cent), Ukrainians (0.8 per cent), and Jews (0.8 per cent). Lithuanians therefore accounted for four-fifths of the population of the Lithuanian SSR and this proportion is growing. Russians constituted the second large national group of inhabitants; nearly one citizen in twelve was Russian.

In the Latvian SSR Latvians accounted for 56.8 per cent

---

* A. I. Kholmogorov, *Internatsionalniye cherty sovetskikh natsii* (The International Features of Soviet Nations), Moscow, 1970, pp. 189-190.

of the total population of 1.34 million; Russians, for 29.8 per cent (0.7 million); and Byelorussians, for 4 per cent (0.09 million).

Estonia has the smallest population of all the Union republics. In 1970 its population consisted of 0.92 million Estonians (68.2 per cent of the total) and 0.3 million Russians (24.7 per cent of the total).

The population of the Moldavian SSR is comprised of 2.3 million Moldavians (64.6 per cent), 0.5 million Ukrainians (14.2 per cent), 0.41 million Russians (11.6 per cent), 0.12 million Gagauz (3.5 per cent), and 0.1 million Jews (2.7 per cent).

Siberia contains numerous nationalities and tribal groups—Nanaians, Nivkhi, Selkups, Ulchi, Saami, Udeghe, Itelmens, Kets, Orochi, Nganasans, and Yukaghirs, usually settled over vast territories. Some areas, such as the Altai, Krasnoyarsk, Primorsky and Khabarovsk territories and the Amur, Irkutsk, Kamchatka, Kemerovo, Kurgan, Magadan, Novosibirsk, Omsk, Sakhalin, Tomsk, Tyumen and Chita regions, are populated mostly by Russians. An ethnically mixed population is also usually characteristic of those Autonomous republics of the RSFSR which are in Siberia. Thus, in the Buryat ASSR Buryats account for 22 per cent and Russians for 73 per cent of the population; in the Yakut ASSR Yakuts and Russians account respectively for 43 and 47 per cent of the population. Through living and working together people of different nationalities develop increasing respect for one another.

Clearly this convergence of national and ethnic groups, unlike the analogous processes under capitalism, is purely voluntary and takes place when all nations and nationalities are afforded equal possibilities of free and unhampered development in the economic sphere and in other ways. The nationality of citizens of the USSR is recorded during the census on the democratic principle of the 'self-determination' of the respondent: in other words, the nationality he gives is accepted. The nationality of minors is given by the parents. In mixed families where parents find it difficult to determine the nationality of their children, the census rules recommend that preference be given to the mother's nationality. In this respect also complete democratism and freedom of choice are

observed. It is worth noting that during the 1970 census more than 203,800 Russians named the language of another people as their native language. There are also instances of Soviet citizens claiming nationality and native language which in no way coincided with their ethnic antecedents—a Russian considers himself Yakutian, a Bashkir says that he is Tatar, an Evenk that he is Russian and so on.

An increasing number of Soviet people of various nationalities freely choose to use Russian along with their native language.

A major political objective of the Leninist Party at every stage of its activity has been to extend its views not only to the working people of large developed nations already involved in the struggle for socialism against the monarchy, the bourgeoisie and the landlords, but also to the small nations and nationalities not yet part of the revolutionary movement. This determines its approach to the spread of the Russian language.

Complete equality of languages and the all-round development of all the national languages and literatures are fundamental principles of Soviet Government policy. According to the 1970 census, 94 per cent of the population consider their own national language to be their native language. Therefore concern for the development of national languages continues to bear great political significance; it is vital to socialist democracy.

At the same time Lenin attached great significance to the spread of Russian among the population of Russia, but this spread was to be strictly voluntary. He wrote: 'Russian is a great and mighty language, the liberals tell us. That is all true, we say in reply to the liberals. We know better than you do that the language of Turgenev, Tolstoy, Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevsky is a great and mighty one. We desire more than you do that the closest possible intercourse and fraternal unity should be established between the oppressed classes of all the nations that inhabit Russia, without any discrimination. And we, of course, are in favour of every inhabitant of Russia having the opportunity to learn the great Russian language.

'What we do not want is the element of *coercion*. We do

not want to have people driven into paradise with a cudgel... We do not think that the great and mighty Russian language needs anyone having to study it by *sheer compulsion.* We are convinced that the development of capitalism in Russia, and the whole course of social life in general, are tending to bring all nations closer together. Hundreds of thousands of people are moving from one end of Russia to another; the different national populations are intermingling; exclusiveness and national conservatism must disappear. People whose conditions of life and work make it necessary for them to know the Russian language will learn it without being forced to do so. But coercion (the cudgel) will have only one result: it will hinder the great and mighty Russian language from spreading to other national groups, and, most important of all, it will sharpen antagonism, cause friction in a million new forms, increase resentment, mutual misunderstanding, and so on.'*

Lenin wrote to S. Shaumyan, a prominent Communist party leader, defending proletarian democratism in spreading the Russian language: 'The *Russian* language has undoubtedly been of progressive importance for the numerous small and backward nations. But surely you must realise that it *would have been* of much greater progressive importance had there been no compulsion. Is not an "official language" a stick that *drives people away* from the Russian language? Why will you not understand the *psychology* that is so important in the national question and which, if the slightest coercion is applied, besmirches, soils, nullifies the undoubtedly progressive importance of centralisation, large states and a uniform language? But the economy is still more important *than* psychology: in Russia we *already* have a *capitalist* economy, which makes the *Russian* language essential. But you have no faith in the power of the economy and want to prop it up with the crutches of the rotten police regime. Don't you see that in this way you are *crippling* the economy and hindering its development? Will not the collapse of the wretched police regime multiply tenfold (even a thousand-

* V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, Moscow, 1964, p. 72.

fold) the number of voluntary associations for the protection and spread of the Russian language? No, I absolutely disagree with you, and accuse you of *königlich-preussischer Sozialismus*! *' **

Lenin's evaluation of the progressive role of the Russian language in the history of Russia is extremely significant. The prerequisites of unshakable Leninist friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union can be seen in history. They are: the common struggle against foreign invaders waged within Russia by peoples who spoke different languages, the joint efforts of the revolutionary working class and all toilers to overthrow the monarchy and capitalism, the economic links between the nations and nationalities before the October Revolution, and the mutual influence exercised by the culture of various peoples. That which was unattainable for people in Russia under capitalism has now been achieved thanks to a most attentive, considerate and sensitive attitude to all the languages of all nations and nationalities on the part of Soviet Government and the socialist society. Developments are taking precisely the course charted by Lenin: there is full equality of the languages of all nations and nationalities and also equality in the development of national literatures, and there is a free and extensive spread of the Russian language on the basis of the general upsurge of socialist culture. At the 25th CPSU Congress, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kirghizia, T. U. Usubaliyev, said: 'The upsurge of the Kirghizian nation and the blossoming forth of its culture are inseparably bound up with the ever greater interest that is taken in the life and culture of other nations, and above all in the great Russian people. Russian culture, the Russian language are the most fruitful channel of international intercourse of all nations and nationalities of our country, and a means to their mutual convergence... The Kirghizian people can see themselves only as part of the large and integral family of the Soviet peoples and we will continue to strengthen

---

* Royal Prussian socialism.

** V. I. Lenin, 'A Letter to S. G. Shaumyan. December 6, 1913', *op. cit.*, Vol. 19, Moscow, 1973, pp. 499-500.

further the links of our fraternal friendship with the Russian people, and all Soviet peoples....'*

The spread of the Russian language, which has become the language of mutual intercourse between all nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union, is seen in the USSR as an important factor in the inter-nation, patriotic consolidation of the working people and also bears great social, political, economic, cultural and international significance.

In the 1970 census 141.8 million of the 241.7 million inhabitants of the Soviet Union named Russian as their mother tongue; and 41.8 million non-Russians named Russian as their second language. Three-quarters of the population consider Russian as their native language or have a complete command of it.

Russian is especially widespread among the peoples speaking languages related to Russian or those living side by side with large groups of Russians. Of the former, 49 per cent of the Byelorussians, and 36.3 per cent of the Ukrainians, including those in the western regions of the Ukraine, speak Russian; and of the latter, 62.5 per cent of the Tatars, 58.4 per cent of the Chuvashi, 41.8 per cent of the Kazakhs, 65.7 per cent of the Mordvinians, 53.3 per cent of the Bashkirs, 66.7 per cent of the Chechens, 63.3 per cent of the Udmurts, 62.4 per cent of the Mari, 58.6 per cent of the Ossets and 41.7 per cent of the peoples of Daghestan, speak Russian; and, of those peoples who had a higher standard of literacy before the revolution, 45.2 per cent of the Latvians, 36.1 per cent of the Moldavians, 35.9 per cent of the Lithuanians, and 29 per cent of the Estonians, speak Russian. The proportion of those who have a complete command of the Russian language is also high among the peoples who formerly settled outside major populated centres. For example, 30.1 per cent of the Armenians speak Russian.

The Russian language is relatively less widespread among the Central Asian and Transcaucasian peoples, particularly where they live in large and more or less

---

* XXV syezd *Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soyuza. Stenograficheski otchet*, (25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Stenographic Record), Vol. 1, pp. 260-261.

uniform ethnic communities. So, Russian is spoken by 21.3 per cent of the Georgians, 19.1 per cent of the Kirghizes, 16.6 per cent of the Azerbaijanians, 15.4 per cent of the Turkmens, 14.5 per cent of the Uzbeks and 15.4 per cent of the Tajiks* but, with the internationalisation of economic and other ties and the rapid growth of culture and education, the Russian language is spreading increasingly in these areas as well.

The spread of the Russian language is an immense achievement, associated with a general rise in the educational standard, and greatly facilitates the further progress of Soviet society. There was a time in Daghestan, for example, when persons of different nationalities could communicate only through an interpreter. Now the Soviet peoples communicate freely in Russian, which facilitates cooperation and familiarity with Soviet and world culture. The wide use of Russian for inter-nation communication certainly does not deprive the peoples of their national distinctiveness.

Knowledge of the Russian language facilitates contact between people of different nationalities engaged in production, serving in the Armed Forces and attending educational establishments; it enriches the material and moral culture of each nation and nationality.

Russian is also growing in significance as an international language. It is one of the five working languages of the UN and other international bodies.

Marx and Engels learned Russian because they wanted to read Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov in the original. Today many thousands of people in all countries are learning Russian in order to read the works of Lenin in the original and to have access to Soviet science and culture.

The charge that Russian is compulsorily introduced in the national republics of the Soviet Union is no less than slanderous. Soviet laws provide for the free development of the various languages of the USSR, guaranteeing every

---

* *Itogi Vsesoyuznoi perepisi naseleniya 1970 g.* (Results of the 1970 All-Union Census), Vol. IV, pp. 9-10. Actually, many more are familiar with Russian, knowing it sufficiently well for practical purposes, without being able to say that they have a 'complete command' of the language as the census form required.

Soviet citizen freedom to speak, and educate his children in, any language, without any privileges, restrictions or compulsion to use any one language. Article 36 of the Soviet Constitution reads: 'Citizens of the USSR of different races and nationalities have equal rights. Exercise of these rights is ensured ... by the possibility of using their native language and the languages of other peoples of the USSR.'

On the basis of socialism a far-reaching process of social consolidation is occurring in the USSR. As a result of radical shifts in social relations the entire Soviet people is a close-knit community of socialist classes and social groups cemented by an identity of aims and world outlook: its aim is communism and Marxism-Leninism is its world outlook. The social disunity and antagonism of nations and nationalities, characteristic of capitalism, have long been a thing of the past. Close cooperation between all classes and social groups in society has superseded the tense conflict with the exploiting classes.

Developed socialist society is a society of mature socialist social relations, based on the convergence of all classes and sections of the population, and on legal and actual equality of all nations and nationalities.

The leading role in developed socialist society belongs to the working class. Operating primarily in the industrial sphere, where work has been socialised on a national scale, the working class is the chief exponent of the internationalist principles which unite all social strata, all nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union and affirm the uniformity of the Soviet way of life.

The collective-farm peasantry has shed its former attachment to private ownership and is engaged in large-scale socialist economic enterprises based on recent achievements in science and technology. The development of agrarian-industrial complexes is causing further changes in the Soviet peasantry, as their working habits alter significantly and the extent of socialisation of the economy and its contact with science increase. This opens up new prospects for the convergence and eventual fusion of the two friendly classes of workers and peasants.

Soviet intellectuals are making an increasing contribution to the development of material production, to the

progress of science and technology and to the improvement of the culture and welfare of the Soviet people. Attention to their working conditions and requirements and a differentiated approach to the creative activities of the various branches of the intelligentsia promote the further internationalist consolidation of Soviet society. The achievement of an indissoluble alliance between the working class, peasants and intellectuals, the political foundation of Soviet society, shows that they have converged on a fundamentally new level, and the role of the intellectuals in building a communist society has been enhanced.

Convergence of the classes and social groups in Soviet society is encouraging the growth of inter-nation relations and confirming the Marxist postulate that national animosity will disappear along with the disappearance of class antagonism.

However, development towards greater social uniformity by no means implies national uniformity within Soviet society. Growing friendship and the disappearance of partitions between socialist nations and nationalities certainly does not amount to a disappearance of national distinctiveness in Soviet society. Warning against the middle-class justification of nationalism even before the revolution, Lenin pointed out that the proletariat champions most staunchly and consistently a democratic approach to the national question and rejects the perpetuation of national partitions.

Every Marxist is aware of the distinction between social development under capitalism and under mature socialism. The progress of socialist nations and nationalities is only possible through international consolidation and to speak of a 'withering away' of the nations and nationalities in the USSR is actually a contravention of Marxism, and unrelated to the realities of Soviet society. Lenin was making an important point when he said that 'international culture is not non-national'.* But he also insisted on a class-based, social, proletarian-internationalist approach to aspects of national life and in particular to popular

* V. I. Lenin, 'Critical Remarks on the National Question', *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, Moscow, 1964, p. 24.

culture, and on extracting from it all that was consistently democratic and socialist. He emphasised that questions of 'national form' should be posed and tackled entirely on the basis of the interests of the working class and all workers in their struggle for socialism and consistent democracy. Soviet nations and nationalities, far from withering away, are developing further, in exactly the same direction as the whole of Soviet society.

The Leninist nationalities policy is based on the fact that the convergence of nations and nationalities is an objective process, which must not be artificially hastened, for it is dictated by the very course of life. It is, however, impermissible to try to restrain convergence and perpetuate national exclusiveness.

Socialism transforms nations and nationalities qualitatively, giving a new inner meaning to distinctive national features and traditions and linking them inseparably to international processes.

The dialectics of national relations under developed socialism can be seen in the fact that, as the national and the international interact, they become increasingly interwoven.

In the interaction between the international and the national, the former takes the lead, but nevertheless the national is not opposed to the international under socialism, as it so often is under capitalism.

Developed socialism shows that just as the flourishing of nations promotes their convergence, the convergence itself rests on the further flourishing of nations.

THE SOVIET PEOPLE, A SOCIAL AND INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

The modern epoch is characterised by two features: the development of new consolidation processes—the emergence and growth of international communities—and the operation of the objective laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale.

The development of consolidation processes takes place in a complex situation in which two world systems, the socialist and the capitalist, coexist, and the sovereign rights

of the developing countries, which have emerged as the result of the collapse of the imperialist colonial system, become firmly established. This new stage of consolidation also sees a redistribution of world forces and the rise of a specific system of inter-state relations, with its own international law, diplomacy and military potential. Greater significance now attaches to the efforts of the socialist countries, the international working class and the national liberation movement to oppose the aggressive militarist forces of imperialism in the name of peace, democracy and socialism.

The main direction of mankind's material and moral progress today is towards internationalisation and the growing unity, solidarity and cooperation of the broadest masses, of all the world's democratic, peace-loving forces.

The time when national communities were isolated and antagonistic, as they were, for instance, in the Middle Ages, is over.

The international working class—the foremost social force—and the world socialist system, which it has created, are in the centre of today's progressive processes. Even before the revolution Lenin urged the need to defend the 'unity of the proletarian struggle and the proletarian organisations, amalgamating these organisations into a close-knit international association, despite bourgeois strivings for national exclusiveness'.* What was needed was 'unity irrespective of nation', he wrote. 'We shall, however, serve the cause of the international workers: we shall rally, unite and merge the workers of all nations for united and joint activities.'**

The tendency towards internationalisation, inherent in modern productive forces and the scientific and technological revolution, is evident within the capitalist system too but there it finds expression in the growth of big capitalist monopolies, which are often multinational. Social production in the West serves the ends of private appropriation and monopoly superprofit, which leads to

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Right of Nations to Self-Determination', *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, p. 454.

** V. I. Lenin, 'Editorial Comment on Ocksen Lola's "Appeal to the Ukrainian Workers"', *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, p. 494.

greater exploitation and enslavement, war, inflation, unemployment, and every kind of crisis.

Under socialism, as has been demonstrated by the experience of the Soviet Union and fraternal socialist countries, the internationalisation of the material and intellectual life of society is in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the people. And internationalisation can only be achieved on the basis of the abolition of exploitation, of the united and joint activities of peoples who enjoy complete equality, on the basis of genuine democracy, of the equality and brotherhood of working people of all nations and nationalities. There is also a fundamental change in inter-state relations, a movement towards peaceful coexistence as the sole realistic alternative to the policy of aggression and war.

Growing social uniformity sums up all the changes Soviet society has undergone. The indissoluble unity of the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intellectuals has become even stronger; the distinctions between the main social groups are gradually disappearing. Life itself in the Soviet Union is bringing together all the nations and nationalities. A new historical community, the Soviet people, has emerged. The scientific and political definition of the Soviet people as a new historical community has opened a new and important chapter in the understanding of universal consolidation processes. The generalising and forecasting functions of science must combine in approaching this fundamental issue, which also largely determines the strategy of scientific inquiry, discloses the most promising and essential lines of research and practical action, and brings us to a better understanding of this stage in the development of Soviet society. While revealing the continuity of the problems to be tackled, it shows that they are notably different from those already solved in previous years.

Describing this qualitatively new community of people, Leonid Brezhnev told the 24th CPSU Congress, held in 1971, that 'new, harmonious relations, relations of friendship and cooperation, were formed between the classes and social groups, nations and nationalities in joint labour, in the struggle for socialism and the battles fought in defence of socialism. Our people are welded together

by a common Marxist-Leninist ideology and the lofty aims of building communism. The multinational Soviet people demonstrate their unanimous approval of the Communist Party's policy'.*

The social unity and international character of this community were stressed in the Theses of the CC CPSU for the centenary of Lenin's birth: 'A social, ideological and political unity of all sections of the working people, of all citizens has been established in the USSR regardless of origin, occupation, nationality, sex or education. The Soviet people are a fundamentally new international human community, a socialist alliance of all working people of the USSR, whether engaged in industry, in farming or in the field of culture, whether involved in physical or mental labour. This alliance forms the social foundation of the multinational state of the whole people.'** Thanks to the far-reaching and comprehensive social and political changes it has undergone, Soviet society has ascended to a qualitatively different level. Lenin's statement that socialism 'creates new and superior forms of human society' has been proved true.***

This new community—the Soviet people—is: (a) a growing economic community, which is based on socialist ownership of the means of production, on the entire economic system of the developed socialist society, and especially on the modern productive forces of socialism. These features are becoming increasingly international, transcending not only the limits of once isolated local economies, but also the limits of the Soviet Union; (b) a social community, comprised of the working class, peasants and intellectuals—all classes and social groups of the socialist society; (c) an ideological and political international community characterised by the convergence of all classes and social groups, all nations and nationalities, and by the establishment of lasting friendship between them.

The primary influence in the formation of the Soviet

* *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, p. 92.

** *K stoletiyu so dnya rozhdeniya Vladimira Ilyicha Lenina.* Tezisy Tsentralnogo Komiteta Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soyuza (Centenary of Lenin's Birth. Theses of the CC CPSU), Moscow, 1970, pp. 32-33.

*** V. I. Lenin, 'The Position and Tasks of the Socialist International', *op. cit.*, Vol. 21, Moscow, 1964, pp. 38-39.

people is exercised by the CPSU, a Leninist internationalist party, which unites the foremost representatives of all Soviet nations and nationalities. It is the clearest embodiment of the staunch comradeship between Soviet working people and of the Soviet people's indissoluble unity. All Communists, whatever their nationality, are members of the one Leninist Party, enjoying equal rights and accepting equal responsibilities. The Party has succeeded in turning internationalism, once an ideal cherished by a handful of Communists, into a profound conviction and a moral code subscribed to by many millions of Soviet people of all nationalities. The Party was able to do this because it has always been intolerant of any internal deviations from the Leninist nationalities policy, fighting all such deviations tooth and nail and firmly defending and carrying forward the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

The new Constitution of the USSR (1977), which further developed the principles of internationalism, states that the Communist Party determines the general perspectives of the development of society and the course of the home and foreign policy of the USSR, directs the great constructive efforts of the Soviet people, and imparts a planned, systematic and theoretically substantiated character to their struggle for the victory of communism.

The establishment of a developed socialist society in the Soviet Union and its progress towards communism are a great feat which redounds to the credit of the whole Soviet people. Mutual intercourse and joint activities greatly facilitate the tremendous task of their building of communism. Every day brings fresh confirmation of Lenin's postulate on the highly dynamic character of socialist society. As early as September 1917 he wrote: '...how infinitely mendacious is the ordinary bourgeois conception of socialism as something lifeless, rigid, fixed once and for all, whereas in reality *only* socialism will be the beginning of a rapid, genuine, truly mass forward movement, embracing first the *majority* and then the whole of the population, in all spheres of public and private life.'*

* V. I. Lenin, 'The State and Revolution', *op. cit.*, Vol. 25, Moscow, 1977, p. 477.

Today Soviet workers, peasants and intellectuals of all nations and nationalities are active participants in this powerful movement. Their weapons are militant socialist internationalism and Soviet patriotism. The Soviet people are proof against illusions of national superiority and absurd notions of national or racial exclusiveness, for the Party and the realities of socialist life imbue them with the spirit of internationalism. All Soviet citizens, whatever their nationality, are proud of their great country and the inspired endeavours of those millions who, led by the Communists, have built a new, truly equitable and free society and established the indissoluble fraternal alliance of numerous peoples. They are proud of the exploits of millions of heroes and heroines, the sons and daughters of these peoples, who gave their lives, fighting to carry out the revolution and safeguard its gains. They take pride in the great achievements of emancipated labour, the strides made by science, the blossoming of culture in its diverse national forms—in the entire Soviet life-style, which has opened up new horizons, new moral values and ideals to mankind.

The Soviet national pride has today become a reality. 'The national pride of the Soviet man,' Leonid Brezhnev noted, 'is a sentiment that is great, all-embracing and immensely rich in content. It is more far-reaching and profound than the natural national feelings of each of the peoples making up our country. It has absorbed all the finest accomplishments of the labour, courage and creative genius of millions of Soviet people.

'...The farther we advance in the building of communism and the more diverse and stronger the economic, cultural and other ties linking all the peoples of the USSR become, the stronger and deeper will be this noble sentiment of a great community—the national pride of the Soviet man.'*

There was a time when working-class, proletarian revolutionaries were recruited mainly from among native Russians. Their national pride in the dark years of tsarism, Lenin wrote, was essentially that of internationalists, consistent democrats and fighters for the freedom of

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 115.

the peoples of Russia and the whole world. Since then all the other nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union have totally committed themselves to the world-transforming constructive effort of the Soviet people. The sentiments of militant comradely solidarity and unity of all peoples of the USSR were gradually strengthened during the years of the October Revolution and Civil War, of the construction of socialism, the years of the Great Patriotic War and postwar rehabilitation and development. Within the common family of these peoples a new sense of community and a great new unifying sentiment were born. The Soviet Union is a community of equals.

Lenin's name and cause united prominent representatives of different nations and nationalities in the common struggle for socialism. The Russians Budyonny, Voroshilov, Zhdanov, Kalinin, Kirov and Frunze marched in the same ranks with such prominent leaders of the Leninist core of the Party as the non-Russians Dzhaparidze, Dzerzhinsky, Kosior, Manuilsky, Mikoyan, Narimanov, Postyshev, Rudzutak, Stalin, Sverdlov, Snieckus and Uborevich. Today too, the CPSU and the Soviet state are headed by prominent Leninists of various nationalities.

This new community, the Soviet people, founded on socialist internationalism, represents an enormous step forward in the consolidation of the working people, which does not, however, imply any denial of the interests of or distinctions between the socialist nations and nationalities. On the contrary, it demands that thoughtful and manifold attention be paid to them, that there should be absolute mutual respect and correct and equal attitudes to fraternal cooperation and mutual support. All nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union retain their distinctive features, their national traits and their best traditions and have every possibility to develop their ethnic culture further. But the Soviet people is not a simple sum of nations and in socialist society national features are not a determining factor. Soviet society is simultaneously uniform and multinational; its numerous nations and nationalities are unified by Soviet patriotism, the Soviet way of life and the Soviet character. It is important to note that what is essentially Soviet and applies to the

whole people may manifest itself in one ethnic form or another. Internationalist views, morals and sentiments also allow for the development of the best national traditions and the cross-fertilisation of cultures.

Soviet people do not make an ideal of ethnic distinctiveness, though it will evidently persist in many respects for a very long time, since it emerged during a previous era and is often due to environmental influences. The eminent Soviet poet Rassul Gamzatov, an Avar from Daghestan, writes: 'The October Revolution, which took proletarian internationalism as its banner, removed national partitions. The peoples of Daghestan went to fight for the ideas of the proletarian revolution and defended them together with the mighty family of Soviet peoples. ...The sense of internationalism, the thrill of sharing in the joys and cares of our brother peoples whose unity is eternal and indomitable, the antipathy for nationalism are part of my being and my literary work. As a poet and a citizen, I love all the working people of the world. But I have no reason for loving the counter-revolutionary Gotsinsky [an Avar — *V. S.*]. It even makes me proud to think that I have always denigrated that sworn enemy of my people.' 'Our children have not abandoned their native tongue, and they have learned to speak Russian too. They have learned to sing Ukrainian songs, but have not forgotten their own.'

Rassul Gamzatov loves his people, but he does not idealise its past or its customs. 'Yes, the customs are changing—changing for the better, both in content and form. Some of them are disappearing altogether. What, for instance, does a mountain-dweller today want with the old custom that binds a man to take a wife only from his native village? If love is not to be measured by the yard, nor weighed by the pound, why shouldn't a Daghestanian, whose roads today lie all over the land, fall in love with and marry a girl from any of the republics? The Daghestan mountain people have learned to sift the old customs through the sieve of modern times, and throw away the chaff. They have learned to invest good old traditions and customs with a new, socialist content.'*

* R. Gamzatov, *Obraz zhizni—sovetski* (This Is the Soviet Way of Life), Moscow, 1973, pp. 99-105.

The present stage in the building of communism is characterised by a new level of patriotic and internationalist awareness among the Soviet working people. The masses become increasingly convinced of the pre-eminence of the interests of the state and people as a whole. Everywhere public opinion expresses the mutual respect of people of different nationalities and is, moreover, absolutely intolerant of any departures from internationalist ideology and morality.

The 1977 Soviet Constitution, which grants Soviet people of different nationalities extensive rights in every area of life, links the exercise of these rights with the policy of total convergence of all nations and nationalities and the inculcation of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, thereby institutionalising the brotherhood of peoples.

Chapter Six

INTERNATIONALISM AND THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

> Complete victory over capitalism cannot be won unless the proletariat and, following it, the mass of working people in all countries and nations throughout the world voluntarily strive for alliance and unity.
>
> *V. I. Lenin*

> As for proletarian internationalism, that is, the solidarity of the working class and of Communists in all countries in their struggle for common goals, their solidarity with the struggle for national liberation and social progress, the voluntary cooperation of fraternal Parties, with the equality and respective independence strictly observed, we think that this kind of comradely solidarity which Communists have held aloft for more than a century has lost none of its great significance to this day. It has been and remains a formidable and tested weapon of the Communist Parties and of the working-class movement in general.
>
> *L. I. Brezhnev*

The Great October Socialist Revolution, which has established a new civilisation, free from exploitation and oppression in any shape or form, has ushered in the epoch of universal revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism. This transition is dependent on the interaction of the following three major revolutionary forces: the socialist world system, the international working-class movement and the national liberation movement.

THE TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM—THE MAIN CHARACTERISTIC OF THE EPOCH

The Great October Socialist Revolution marked the beginning of the historic change from capitalism to socialism. Even when only one country—Russia—had dropped out of the chain of world capitalism, Lenin could say: 'The hands of the international bourgeoisie are no

longer free.'* The postwar socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries and in Cuba and the consequent emergence of the socialist world system signified another major defeat for imperialism and a further aggravation of the general crisis of the capitalist system. Imperialism had finally ceased to be the sole dominant influence in the world.

The disappearance of the formerly unlimited power of the world's bourgeoisie and the increasing influence of real socialism on contemporary social development throughout the world affect the entire development of the capitalist system. Certainly, imperialism is not surrendering its positions everywhere; it is still strong and capable of reversing this development in certain parts of the globe. Lenin said: 'The more victorious we are, the more the capitalist exploiters learn to unite and the more determined their onslaught.'**

Imperialism as a social system is and has always been the chief obstacle in the way of mankind's natural progress towards peace, democracy and socialism. Because of imperialism, today's pressing and fundamental problems which could be relatively easy to cope with—hunger, poverty, disease, unemployment, environmental pollution and the arms race—are still unresolved. Imperialism is the arch-enemy not only of the international working class and its vanguard, the communist movement, but also of all the forces fighting for working people's rights and for the abolition of all social and national oppression. It is still a formidable and dangerous enemy of the peoples and the strongest, albeit the last, of all the exploitative systems men have ever known. However, imperialism can no longer change the course of history. The inexorable diminution of the scope and effect of its impact on the progress of world history is an objective law.

Many features of contemporary imperialism stem from its need to adapt itself to present-day realities, to the coexistence of and antagonism between two opposing world systems. The ruling circles in the imperialist

* V. I. Lenin, 'Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), March 18-23, 1919', *op. cit.*, Vol. 29, p. 203.

** V. I. Lenin, 'Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.). March 29-April 5, 1920', *op. cit.*, Vol. 30, p. 450.

countries are afraid that the class struggle could develop into a mass revolutionary movement. The imperialist bourgeoisie tries to apply more subtle methods to exploit and oppress the working people, even granting certain reforms in order to maintain its ideological and political hold upon the masses. The monopolies eagerly exploit the scientific and technological revolution to raise efficiency and accelerate the growth of production, and intensify the exploitation and oppression of the working people.

Imperialism possesses a highly organised production system and relies on powerful productive forces. It also actively utilises the possibilities afforded by the growing fusion of the monopolies and the state machinery and does everything possible to promote the formation of state monopolies, thus enhancing the economic role of the state.

Both economic and intellectual activities in the capitalist world are becoming internationalised. This process proceeds in conflicting and highly complicated ways: the tendency towards internationalisation manifests itself especially under the impact of the technological revolution, the growth and extension of international division of labour, the specialisation and cooperation of production, expanding international economic ties and the internationalisation of science and technology.

As early as 1914 Lenin, in the work 'Karl Marx', wrote: 'The socialisation of labour, which is advancing ever more rapidly in thousands of forms and has manifested itself very strikingly, during the half-century since the death of Marx, in the growth of large-scale production, capitalist cartels, syndicates and trusts, as well as in the gigantic increase in the dimensions and power of finance capital, provides the principal material foundation for the inevitable advent of socialism.'* Now, almost a hundred years after the death of Marx, the internationalisation of production has reached a much higher level, proceeding far beyond the national limits of the capitalist economies.

Internationalisation of economic, and partly also of intellectual, production in the capitalist world vividly manifests itself in the emergence of international cartels,

---

* V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. 21, p. 71.

which Lenin described as supermonopolies. At present the multinational corporations hold more than two-thirds of world trade in their hands.

The rapid growth of multinational corporations, their international investments, their ascendancy in trade and their increasing control of capitalist world production are distinctive features of modern capitalism. These corporations are simultaneously the offspring and the driving force of the internationalisation of finance capital and of the expansion of material production in the capitalist world economy. They play an important role in capitalism's economic decision-making and in the increased exploitation of the working people.

The international monopolies are prime examples of the socialisation of production, which increasingly transcends national limits. Some international monopolies wield more economic power than individual capitalist countries. However, expanding international monopoly operations inevitably come in conflict with the economic policies of certain capitalist countries and with their attempts to plan their national economic development.

Current imperialist integration, which encompasses the economic, political and military activities of the Western capitalist countries, is, above all else, the reaction of the monopoly bourgeoisie to the further growth of the socialist community, to the collapse of the imperialist colonial system and to the upsurge of working-class struggle in the capitalist countries. Imperialist integration has become a means to mobilise all the economic, scientific, technical, military, political and ideological forces of the monopoly bourgeoisie in their struggle against world socialism. The main strategic objective of imperialism is to spare no efforts to change the world alignment of forces in its own favour.

Simultaneously with imperialist integration, there develops a contrary tendency, that of intensifying imperialist rivalry and conflicts between the capitalist countries. The report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 25th Congress noted: 'The governments of capitalist countries are making repeated attempts to moderate the contradictions and come to terms on joint anti-crisis measures. But the nature of imperialism is such that each endeavours to

gain advantages at the expense of others, to impose his will. Differences surface in new forms, and contradictions erupt with new force.'*

Although bitter rivals, the leading capitalist countries are making serious efforts to coordinate their policies towards the socialist countries, the developing nations and the democratic and working-class movements. Meetings of heads of state and governments of imperialist countries have become common. Such meetings attempt to find some means of dealing with the economic crisis, inflation, unemployment and disorder in their monetary systems and to arrive at some sort of a 'new course' for rescuing world capitalism. All this is to be undertaken at the expense of the working people.

On the other hand, capitalism's ingrained contradictions between the national and inter-national principles are becoming more acute. Bourgeois ideologists suggest two different ways of dealing with them: some advocate a return to national isolation; others, on the contrary, declare the national state a historical anachronism and call for the establishment of some form of 'supranational', 'supragovernmental' system to coordinate the development of capitalism on a world scale, alleging that such a system can smooth away inter-state differences and prevent the international monopolies from clashing with the interests of the individual Western countries.

Both these views are supported by different sections of the bourgeoisie, whose interests often sharply diverge and even clash. If the exponents of the former trend are vainly trying to stop the development of productive forces, which is increasingly transcending national boundaries, their opponents are beguiling themselves with the illusion that such bourgeois-cosmopolitan hocus-pocus can remove the gaping distinctions and fundamental contradictions which stand in the way of their harebrained schemes for establishing a bourgeois world state, beginning in Western Europe.

Today's extraordinary and increasing concentration and centralisation of capitalist production, of the banks and

---

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 33-34.

the means of communication show that capitalist production is becoming increasingly social in nature. The tremendous increase in socialisation of production and centralisation of management under state-monopoly capitalism dramatically intensify the main contradiction of the capitalist system, that between the social character of production and private mode of appropriation. It emphasises the absurdity of a situation in which huge production complexes, often serving more than one country, are owned by a limited monopoly group. The economic and social structure of capitalist society comes into increasing conflict with the needs of the masses and the requirements of social progress and democratic development.

The increased possibilities of industrial production, of science and technology are used by the monopolies for their selfish ends, to intensify the exploitation and oppression of the masses, to strengthen the apparatus of coercion and build up the machinery of military aggression. The chasm between the privileged elite and the teeming masses of the working class and all working people is widening. Imperialism is a constant menace to social rights and exhibits an inherent and dangerous tendency to abolish democratic freedoms, toughen the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and increasingly violate human rights.

The military-industrial complex, the alliance between the biggest monopolies and the military, is wielding real and growing economic and political power. In some Western countries it is gaining momentum, opposing the bourgeois-democratic system and seeking to dominate it. The military-industrial complex is exerting a growing influence on the policies pursued by the imperialist states, rendering them even more reactionary and aggressive.

Militarism, a fundamental element of imperialism, has reached unprecedented dimensions, and its more aggressive advocates are stimulating the arms race. Scientific discoveries, enormous material resources and the labour of millions are made to serve aggressive military aims. Plans are being made to step up the production of armaments within the next several decades, although this

can only impose an intolerable burden on the working people and bring closer the threat of war.

The militarist circles are putting increasing pressure on their governments to further improve weaponry by exploiting the latest discoveries in science and technology. The production of weapons of mass annihilation is swallowing up a vast proportion of national resources and industrial and scientific potential.

The giant corporations, in a firm partnership with militarism, are bringing their political and economic weight to bear on government, often exercising a determining influence on major decisions in domestic and foreign policy.

Many Western political leaders and ideologists continue to count upon the use of modern capitalism's reserves while they still can. The ruling circles in the leading capitalist countries seek to exploit the possibilities of the scientific and technological revolution and to extend state-monopoly regulation of the economy in order to achieve a considerable development of the productive forces and, above all, to prop up their social system. This would indeed change the general trend of current world development to their advantage but such calculations founder on hard realities.

Crises convulse the capitalist world, crises in the currency system which lead to inflation, crises in fuel, energy and raw materials. Mass unemployment is growing by leaps and bounds, and the scramble for capital and commodity markets and sources of raw material is getting fiercer. The development of capitalism today confirms that no amount of state-monopoly regulation can surmount the ingrained contradictions of the capitalist social system.

According to the estimates of bourgeois economists, the crisis that hit the capitalist system in the early 1970s is comparable only to the Great Depression of 1929-1933. Between 1974 and 1975 industrial production in some Western countries dropped by 8 to 14 per cent.

The crisis has spread to all major centres of the capitalist world economy simultaneously, thus increasing its effects on the countries concerned. It also extends to those capitalist countries which, being thought show-

windows of the 'economic miracle', had considered themselves immune from crisis after the war (West Germany, Japan, Switzerland, Spain, etc.).

An important feature of the current capitalist economic crisis is its profound and universal character, which makes it particularly difficult to overcome. Whereas previously those countries which were hit by a crisis could take measures through the markets of crisis-free states, they can no longer do this.

The economic crisis is general precisely because the capitalist economies are closely bound together, as a result of the ever-closer interlacing of production under monopoly capitalism, in a single world economy. Lenin wrote that capitalism exhibited 'the rapid expansion of a close network of channels which cover the whole country, centralising all capital and all revenues, transforming thousands and thousands of scattered economic enterprises into a single national capitalist, and then into a world capitalist, economy.'*

There is a growing conflict between, on the one hand, an objective need for systematic development, which is essential given the present level of productive forces and the commercial anarchy characteristic of capitalism, on the other.

The scientific and technological revolution aggravates the fundamental contradictions of the capitalist system, since it calls for even greater integration of production, for long-term forecasting and planning and improved management. These needs clash with the uneven development of the capitalist economies, with the intense competition between monopolies and so on. Indeed, the monopolies often hamper the development of science and technology.

As the productive forces develop and the international division of labour which is dependent on those forces extends its scope, there arises a growing contradiction between the need to put economic life upon an even more international footing and the conflicting desire of national governments to maintain their grip upon their own economic systems.

* V. I. Lenin, 'Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism', *op. cit.*, Vol. 22, p. 213.

While narrowing to a certain degree the sphere in which the private capitalist economic mechanism can operate untrammelled, the development of state-monopoly tendencies has its limits, for as it increases the scale of socialisation of labour, it naturally comes into conflict with the very principle of private ownership.

The common long-term interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie in various countries, reflected in state-monopoly regulation, constantly clash with the selfish interests of individual monopolies or groups of monopolies. The development of state-monopoly capitalism inexorably aggravates the main contradiction of capitalism—that between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation, between labour and capital. This contradiction is the mainspring of historical development, it is the economic basis of the social revolution which causes the transition from capitalism to socialism.

The consolidation of the socialist world system, the growing class struggle of the working people against monopoly oppression and the successes of the national liberation movement are all proof of the development of the world revolutionary process.

THE FRATERNAL SOCIALIST COMMUNITY

It is thirty years now since socialism developed beyond the boundaries of one country and became a socialist world system, in which the working class and its parties hold power and are a mighty international force.

The emergence and development of the socialist world system is the second major stage—after the Great October Revolution and the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union—in the development of the communist system on a world scale. The scientific foresight of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, who envisaged the international alliance of peoples as they embarked on a socialist path, has thus been validated. Engels wrote: 'Only the proletarians can destroy nationality, only the awakening proletariat can bring about fraternisation between the

different nations.'* Lenin scientifically substantiated the inevitable internationalisation of the economic, political and intellectual life of the peoples under socialism and of the future tendency towards the establishment of a single universal socialist economy. He stressed that the dictatorship of the proletariat would transcend the national boundaries of a single country, would become international. Lenin wrote that the dictatorship of the proletariat would be converted 'from a national dictatorship (i.e., existing in a single country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat involving at least several advanced countries, and capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole)'.** Lenin foresaw that the victorious proletariat must have 'a close military and economic alliance'.***

As a result of the socialist revolutions in a number of countries in the East and West towards the end of and after the Second World War (promoted by the victory of the Soviet Union and other progressive forces in the war), socialism became a world system. Today, alongside the Soviet Union—the greatest of the countries with a developed socialist system and one of the most powerful industrialised countries in the world—other countries in Europe, Asia and Latin America have embarked on the socialist path.

The Marxist-Leninist world outlook, which embodies the vital interests of the working class, is being adopted by ever broader sections of progressive humanity. Turning what was once a brilliant scientific concept into part of the daily life of hundreds of millions of men and women in different areas of the globe, socialism is a vivid illustration of the manifold creative capacity of the broadest mass of people.

Today in the socialist world we see implemented lofty ideals, which encompass freedom from exploitation and

---

* Frederick Engels, 'The Festival of Nations in London'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, p. 6.

** V. I. Lenin, 'Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions', *op. cit.*, Vol. 31, p. 148.

*** V. I. Lenin, 'Letter to the Workers and Peasants of the Ukraine Apropos of the Victories Over Denikin', *op. cit.*, Vol. 30, p. 296.

oppression, establishment of the sovereign power of emancipated labour, comprehensive development of socialist democracy, growing cultural and financial well-being among the vast majority of the people and genuine equality and fraternity between all nations and nationalities.

The contemporary socialist world is a young and growing social organism which is in a state of constant change and improvement. The socialist system, which has been firmly established in the historical struggle with capitalism, has proved its internal stability, its invincible historical vitality. Guided by the international doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and relying on the creative capacity of wide sections of the people, the socialist countries, led by the communist parties of the working class, have evolved an entirely new system of mutual relations. 'Not only are we now theoretically aware,' Leonid Brezhnev said, 'but also have been convinced in practice that the way to socialism and its main features are determined by the general regularities, which are inherent in the development of all the socialist countries. We are also aware that the effect of the general regularities is manifested in different forms consistent with concrete historical conditions and national specifics. It is impossible to build socialism without basing oneself on general regularities or taking account of the concrete historical specifics of each country. Nor is it possible without a consideration of both these factors correctly to develop relations between the socialist states.'*

The emergence of socialism from within the boundaries of a single country has convincingly shown that it alone is the main path along which human civilisation can develop in a regular and progressive way. Among the general features and regularities of the socialist reorganisation of life are: the alliance of the working class, peasants and intellectuals led by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party; the social ownership of the means of production; the systematically planned growth of society's productive forces and the improvement of living stand-

* *24th Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 9-10.

ards; the relevant changes in society's cultural, political and ideological life; and an appropriate defence capacity.

Having risen to the status of the leading force of society, the working class of the socialist countries has to solve fundamentally new problems. The experience of history has demonstrated the necessity for fraternal unity among the peoples who have embarked on the socialist path. By the same token, proletarian internationalism has acquired a new and fuller content, and has developed into socialist internationalism. Socialist internationalism is a new manifestation of consolidation processes in world history.

During their struggle against internal and external class enemies, socialist states, previously at different levels of socio-economic and social development and often following different historical paths, have built a new system of inter-state relations, free from inequality, oppression, exploitation and enslavement.

The theory and practice of these relations are expounded in the documents of the communist and workers' parties of the fraternal socialist countries, and in the works and speeches of their leaders. The invincible strength of world socialism lies precisely in the international unity of the fraternal socialist countries and peoples, in which full account is necessarily taken of the legitimate needs and requirements of each socialist state. Even in the days when Soviet rule was first being established, in May 1918, when the imperialists were prepared to suppress the first Socialist Republic, Lenin wrote: 'Since October 25, 1917, we have been defencists. We are for "defence of the fatherland"; but that patriotic war towards which we are moving is a war for a socialist fatherland, for socialism as a fatherland, for the Soviet Republic as a *contingent* of the world army of socialism.'*

In 1920, foreseeing the triumph of the working class in not only one but several countries, Lenin saw that it would be necessary to struggle tirelessly for proletarian internationalism and against every kind of bourgeois national-chauvinism, including the opportunist and crude-

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Chief Task of Our Day', *op. cit.*, Vol. 27, Moscow, 1965, p. 163.

ly pacifist distortion of the concept of internationalism which declares internationalism to be no more than 'the recognition of the equality of nations'. Lenin's profound and far-sighted ideas are being borne out by the entire course of modern social development.

Leninist internationalist policy is at the root of the relations between the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries. As Leonid Brezhnev said, 'the closest to us Communists, to our minds and hearts, is that part of the world where communist ideals—freedom from exploitation and oppression, full power of the working people, development of socialist democracy, flowering of culture and increase of the well-being of the broad masses, equality and fraternity of all peoples and nationalities—are being embodied in practice.'*

'For socialism as a fatherland', one of Lenin's slogans, has profound significance to the peoples of the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries and to working and exploited peoples the world over. When the Soviet Union was the only socialist country in the world, the attitude of a person or nation towards it was the best means of gauging their support of, or opposition to, the working class, democracy and peace, while today the attitude to world socialism, the fraternal socialist countries and to revolutionary world forces must also be considered.

The socialist world system is an international community of countries and peoples without precedent in human history. The report of the CC CPSU to the 25th Congress stated: 'The ties between socialist states are becoming ever closer with the flowering of each socialist nation and the strengthening of their sovereignty, and elements of community are increasing in their policy, economy, and social life. There is a gradual levelling up of their development.'** The socialist world system stimulates the unity of the international working class and all working people, a unity vital not only to the socialist countries but to the whole world.

The ideological essence of internationalism and, fur-

---

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 5.
** *Ibid.*, p. 9.

ther, its objective material essence are embodied in the socialist revolution, which is a forum of international action and confirmation of internationalist principles. Internationalism is yet more clearly reflected in the construction of socialism and developed socialism. Man is today's main productive force and his wide-ranging activities, once they are organised and directed on the basis of freedom from exploitation, have proved to be enormously important to today's new and higher forms of consolidation.

The development of the socialist world system simultaneously signifies the formation of a new historical community of countries and peoples. Socialism rests objectively on the socialist mode of production, on the leading role taken by the working class in society, on the uniformity of Marxist-Leninist ideology, on brotherhood, friendship and the identity of human interests in the struggle for socialism and communism and for peace, against the aggressive designs and activities of imperialism.

In the socialist countries a radical reorganisation of the life of society on new principles has brought together those peoples who have been emancipated from capitalist exploitation and has strengthened their ties and their mutual cooperation on the basis of contemporary, highly developed productive forces. The relations between the socialist states embrace absolutely all aspects of life, as their political, economic, scientific, technological, cultural, military and ideological ties continually grow stronger. As they advance farther along the road to socialism, their relations become more extensive, varied and rich, since the broadest masses of working people are involved in their development.

An important role in the cooperation of socialist states is played by the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, set up in May 1955 as a defence measure. Its establishment signified a qualitatively new stage in the development of the manifold cooperation between the socialist countries, which has put their collective and cooperative action in such vital areas as foreign policy and defence on a solid foundation. The fraternal socialist countries have brought their unity and strength to oppose the aggressive forces of

imperialism. The Soviet Armed Forces are enormously significant in safeguarding the gains of world socialism, while Soviet nuclear potential is another powerful factor in curbing the aggressive forces of international imperialism and averting another world war.

The Warsaw Treaty countries are so closely united that no alliance or coalition, past or present, can compare with them in terms of strength. This association of peoples and countries is not based merely on the identity of interests of a group of countries but is, rather, a fraternal family guided by Marxist-Leninist parties and cemented by a common world outlook, common ideals and friendly, mutually supportive, relations. It is a union which relies on a genuine unity of positions and actions, which lends additional strength to its members as they cope with their national and international tasks, defend their revolutionary gains and strive for lasting peace and security. The aggregate international weight and influence of the members of the Warsaw Treaty are thus many times greater than the sum of its individual parts would seem to warrant. It has become the mainstay of the forces of freedom and progress throughout the world.

'The establishment and development of the alliance,' Leonid Brezhnev noted, 'took both time and a good deal of collective effort. It was necessary to find an answer to many fundamentally new questions of theory and practice; it was essential to react to various turns of events in a well-considered and timely way. Experience has convincingly shown that with the right Marxist-Leninist approach, we have solved, and are able to solve even the most complex problems so as to promote the strengthening of each socialist country individually and the socialist community as a whole.'*

In the twenty years since it was established the Warsaw Treaty Organisation has eloquently illustrated the drive of the socialist countries towards peace and detente and their efforts to protect the legitimate rights of the peoples. The decisions, policy and defensive stance of the organisation

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Our Course: Peace and Socialism.* A Collection of Speeches by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee (June-July 1974), Moscow, 1974, p. 37.

reflect the complex process by which socialist international relations are continually being improved. 'We now possess a well-adjusted mechanism of interaction between the fraternal countries in all spheres of social life,' Leonid Brezhnev noted. 'For two decades the Warsaw Treaty Organisation has been a solid and reliable foundation for the political and defensive cooperation of the European socialist countries. The fact is indisputable that it has played an enormous part in the defence of the gains of socialism and continues to be a good instrument of our common world policy.'*

The leading parties of the socialist countries pay paramount attention to the steady extension of mutual cooperation in defence, in their political life and in the coordination of their actions on the international scene. A great role in this is played by the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee which considers questions pertaining to the relations between members, discusses those European and international problems which interest them, and develops a coordinated political line. There is a constant exchange of experiences in building socialism and communism.

'We are firmly against the world's division into opposing military blocs and the arms race,' it was pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress. 'Our attitude on this score is well known. But we must make it clear that as long as the NATO bloc continues to exist and as long as militarist elements continue their arms drive, our country and the other signatories of the Warsaw Treaty will continue to strengthen this political-military alliance.'**

From its very outset the activities of this alliance have been truly humanitarian, which is a fundamental difference between it and those alliances which are based on the selfish interests and aims of the exploiting countries. Albeit a formidable bastion against the forces of reaction and war, it is at the same time the world's most peace-loving organisation. The Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was convened on its initiative; it has also put forward a whole range of

---

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 542.

** *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 11-12.

proposals whose implementation would end the arms race and eliminate the threat of nuclear war. 'Our strength,' Leonid Brezhnev declared, 'is the bulwark of peace for everyone combating the threat of another world war. By defending socialism and peace we defend the future of mankind.'* The organisation's members have never and will never pursue agressive aims but will always, under any circumstances, defend their independence and sovereignty and they will defend any people's right to build a socialist society in freedom and in close cooperation with other socialist nations.

However, the socialist countries cannot ignore the fact that the aggressive NATO bloc continues to increase its military potential, which compels the Warsaw Treaty countries to hold their defences and their military capacity at an appropriate level. They will also continue to take all necessary measures in order to guarantee the future security of their peoples.

This organisation ensures the security of the countries of the socialist community and is an effective shield for their socialist gains. Mutual defence against the encroachments of imperialism is the sacred duty of each member country.

Economics, science and technology constitute a vital part of the fraternal peoples' struggle for socialism and communism. In the context of today's scientific and technological revolution the indisputable advantages of the socialist organisation of society are being more fully realised on both a national and an international scale. Socialism's economic position is growing stronger. The socialist countries account for an increasing share of world output, the socialist economy is becoming more efficient and its organisation and management methods are continually improving.

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), set up in January 1949, was the first such international socialist organisation and is now one of the strongest elements in the world economy. Under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist parties the members of the CMEA

---

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, Prague, 1969, p. 146.

have become the most dynamic economic force in the world. Since its inauguration the member countries have made considerable headway in industrialisation and the equalisation of their economic levels. At present the European CMEA members have turned from agrarian or agrarian-industrial into industrial or industrial-agrarian countries. Radical improvements have been made in the structure of the entire economy, large national and inter-state economic complexes have been set up and everything necessary to continue the building of a developed socialist society has been provided.

The Comprehensive Programme of Socialist Economic Integration, which was adopted in 1971 and has raised the economic potential of the CMEA countries to a qualitatively new level, has been of immense significance to the extension of their cooperation, has further developed the socialist division of labour and improved the efficiency and extent of its organisation. Such cooperation between the fraternal countries matches the nature and high aims of socialism. An increase in this cooperation encourages the harmonious development of the national economies, ensuring a rapid growth of industry and agriculture and helping the less economically developed countries to make swift progress.

The CMEA member countries are now coordinating their national economic plans; CMEA has adopted for the first time a collective plan of multilateral integration for the period 1976-1980. A whole range of cooperation programmes, effective for up to fifteen years, are being developed in major branches of material production. This promotes the socialist economic integration of the CMEA countries, and facilitates the joint exploitation of their natural resources, as well as their material and manpower resources, in both the national and the common interest.

New patterns of cooperation between the socialist countries are being developed and improved. CMEA members are jointly building large industrial complexes and transport and agricultural enterprises. They are at present constructing a mammoth gas pipeline from Orenburg to the Western border of the USSR, which will supply the European members of CMEA with up to 15.5 thousand million cubic metres of gas a year. The idea of

building a single power grid to supply CMEA members with electricity is being considered. In the Soviet Union the CMEA countries are cooperating in the construction of the Ust Ilimsk pulp combine and the Kiembai asbestos combine, and the extension of certain ferroalloy factories. A large mining concern, Medet, has been constructed in Bulgaria by the collective effort of workers and experts from Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia. CMEA members are participating in the construction of nickel plants in Cuba and of some enterprises in the Mongolian People's Republic.

Cooperation between CMEA countries in science and technology is steadily improving and extending. About 1,600 scientific research organisations and 47 major coordination centres in member countries are now functioning on a multinational basis. The development of an integrated system of third-generation electronic computers and of new types of atomic power reactors are both signal achievements in scientific and in practical terms. The combined efforts of cosmonauts from socialist countries in Soviet spaceships and on Soviet space stations which are planned for 1978-1983 are an indication of the high level of cooperation in science and technology.

Pointing out the significance of the further development of socialist economic integration, Leonid Brezhnev stressed: 'The matter is not only one of considerable mutual economic advantage, but also of tremendous political significance. It is a matter of strengthening the material basis of our community.'* And it is not only the material results of cooperation that are important but also the fact that the very course of this cooperation helps to strengthen mutual understanding, the collective spirit and a genuinely friendly partnership between socialist countries. In making decisions on specific economic problems these countries give every consideration to each other's interests while also ensuring that their economic relations are mutually beneficial. Concern for the successful development of not only one's own country but of the fraternal socialist countries in general is the highest expression of socialist internationalism.

---

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 13.

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance is now seen, by the non-socialist as well as the socialist nations, as an example of effective international cooperation between countries of different size and with differing economic potential. It is one possible model for the reorganisation of international economic relations on a just and equal footing.

The countries fighting for economic independence and for their sovereignty show an increasing interest in CMEA activities. Although it is an organisation of socially uniform states, it does not act as an exclusive group, rejecting economic relations with other countries. On the contrary CMEA helps to create the prerequisites for cooperation between its members and all interested countries, while at the same time its member countries are the active champions of equal and mutually beneficial cooperation between countries with different social systems. This follows directly from their commitment to peace and is an integral part of the policy of detente and international cooperation.

In 1974 the UN General Assembly granted observer status to the CMEA and by 1976 CMEA was maintaining relations with about 60 inter-governmental and non-governmental international organisations; with 30 of them those relations were on a regular basis.

Socialist economic integration not only leads to a convergence of the fraternal national economies, it also exerts a significant influence on the development of the members of socialist society and their education in the spirit of internationalism. In other words it enables those by whose exertions economic cooperation is realised to come together on the moral plane too.

In the construction and utilisation of large industrial projects, in the operation of joint enterprises and research centres, in the slowly increasing movement of manpower within the framework of the socialist community, in the sharing of experience between top-ranking workers and the exchange of delegations, dozens of thousands of workers, engineers, technicians, business executives and scientists from various countries have daily personal contact and learn to work together. All this promotes the further growth of socialist internationalism, cementing the

friendship and cohesion of working people in the fraternal countries, and paves the way for the formation of an international community of peoples within the socialist world.

At the Berlin Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe held in June 1976, Leonid Brezhnev said: 'The fraternal solidarity among the socialist countries increases the might of each one of them, and equal economic cooperation adds enormous potentialities to each country's own resources. The profound organic and steadily growing friendly ties between Party and state organs, between collectives at enterprises, research institutions, public organisations, among millions upon millions of citizens allow one to speak about an entirely new phenomenon—a genuine fraternal alliance of peoples, united by common convictions and common aims. The militant alliance of Marxist-Leninist Parties is its firm basis, its cementing force.'* The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, said in March 1976: 'Relations of an entirely new type have been established between our countries and peoples. These relations are based on an identical social system, a unity of national and international interests, Marxist-Leninist ideology, and close cooperation between the ruling communist parties.... We reaffirm our conviction that the further development of socialist society in individual socialist countries leads, as Lenin foresaw, to the establishment of a single community of socialist nations.'**

The main basis of the fraternal cooperation of socialist countries, its soul and guiding organisational force, is the militant alliance of the fraternal communist and workers' parties. Meetings of fraternal party leaders make it possible to find joint solutions to complex problems, project future development and work out coordinated programmes of action for the socialist states, on the firm basis of Marxism-Leninism, socialist internationalism, equality and cooperation.

---

* *For Peace, Security and Social Progress in Europe*, Moscow, 1976, p. 20.

** *Pravda*, 30 March 1976.

The strengthening of the fraternal union of socialist states is a complex historical process. Successful development of this process requires that the principles of proletarian internationalism, mutual assistance and support, equality, sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries should be rigorously observed. The unity of all socialist countries, resting on the principles of socialist internationalism, is in the interests of each one of them and of the socialist world system as a whole and is conducive to human progress.

Leonid Brezhnev said: 'The new relations that have been established—thanks to the internationalist policy of the fraternal parties—between the socialist countries, above all between the countries of the socialist community, are a great contribution by the world socialist system to the life of the contemporary world.

'We can say with a clear conscience: our alliance, our friendship and our cooperation are the alliance, friendship and cooperation of sovereign and equal states united by common aims and interests, held together by bonds of comradely solidarity and mutual assistance.

'We are advancing together, helping one another and pooling our efforts, knowledge and resources to move forward as rapidly as possible.'*

Defining the basic policy of a socialist state, Lenin wrote immediately after the October Revolution that the existence of socialist states surrounded by capitalist and pre-capitalist states would pose a task of enormous difficulty. With the emergence of the socialist world system after the last war, the world entered a new epoch of coexistence of and antagonism between two opposing world systems, the capitalist and the socialist. This epoch neither is nor can be a brief period in world history.

The principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is basic to socialist foreign policy. It follows from Lenin's historically validated conclusion that socialism cannot triumph simultaneously in all countries, a principle which Lenin advanced and substantiated some time before the Revolution. Peace and

---

* L. I. Brezhnev, *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress*, pp. 20-21.

international cooperation, the equality and friendship of peoples are the keynote of Lenin's Decree on Peace which was issued directly after the revolution; they have determined Soviet foreign policy ever since. To secure a lasting peace is one of the major foreign policy aims of the socialist states, acting in concert with all the peace-loving, democratic forces of our times.

This goal requires that enormous obstacles be surmounted; it demands the reorganisation of the world system of inter-state relations on a basis fundamentally different from that which supports the system created by the exploiting classes and resting on violence. As a result of the efforts of the forces of peace, it has become possible to avert the threat of another world war and initiate detente and international cooperation.

Unity and cohesion of the fraternal socialist countries, based on socialist internationalism and on their joint action in the world arena, have been decisive in improving the international situation, in helping to preserve and strengthen peace. Joint action by the socialist countries is essential to mankind's social progress.

Lenin said that policy should be judged by its results. The results and effectiveness of socialist foreign policy can be seen in all spheres. The socialist states, relying on their powerful economic and military potential, decisively contribute to the maintenance of general peace and the prevention of another world war.

We have been living in peace for over three decades, due to the efforts of all peace-loving peoples. If the imperialists have failed to unleash a third world war, the credit goes primarily to the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries, to their peace-oriented foreign policy. The socialist states' joint proposals and actions exert, and always have exerted, the strongest influence on international developments. Many aggressive imperialist plans have been frustrated by the active counter-action of the socialist states.

The historical mission of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is to spare no efforts to preserve and strengthen world peace, to end the military conflicts fanned by the imperialists and eliminate the flashpoints of war, to achieve a just settlement of major international

issues, to give total support to national liberation and progressive movements and to take a caring interest in the future of mankind. All this stems from the very nature of the socialist community, in which no classes or social groups are interested in war or the arms race. The socialist community is the main force which opposes the warmongering and military gamesmanship characteristic of aggressive imperialist circles. The socialist countries' policies restrain the forces of reaction, giving imperialism less opportunity to conduct its expansionist foreign policy. The socialist countries' joint stand and their vigorous activities in the world arena make it easier to solve today's urgent problems.

Socialist foreign policy has a great impact on the capitalist system too, influencing the relations between capitalist countries, the interplay of political forces in them, the growing role of the masses in governmental foreign policy decisions and the stimulation of the popular movements and forces which support peace and international security.

The tendency towards the extension of detente has become pre-eminent in today's international relations. It reflects a drastic change in the alignment of international class and political forces. It is visible material evidence that the old social system can no longer impose on the peoples or determine the future of mankind.

Peaceful coexistence is a grim and hard struggle, above all a class struggle, against the most reactionary and aggressive forces of imperialism. These forces can only be defeated by vigorous action on the part of all those interested in maintaining and strengthening peace and detente. The task of preventing war and aiding the transition from a state of almost incessant war to stable and mutually beneficial peaceful coexistence and cooperation of countries with different social systems is a great and responsible one indeed.

The strengthening of peace and international cooperation is in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the world's population. It is one of the most important ways of uniting the forces of peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

When there is peace it is easier for the socialist

countries to achieve their great constructive goals—to further increase material well-being and improve the material and technical base of a society which is free from exploitation and oppression. Working people in capitalist countries can more actively pursue their struggle for democratic rights, higher living standards and social emancipation.

Today the question of peaceful coexistence is fundamental to the destiny of mankind on the material and moral plane. Only the strengthening of peace and the exclusion of war from human life can produce a system of inter-state relations which meets today's needs and, in the long run, assures the further progression of mankind towards democracy and social progress.

In pursuing their policy of peace and international cooperation, the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries expose military aggression and rally world opinion against the arms race. Detente, peaceful coexistence and the renunciation of the arms race are obstructed by powerful and well-organised forces in the capitalist world which are out to poison the international atmosphere and take the world back to the days of the cold war. The socialist countries naturally have to take this into account in conducting their policy. Imperialism cannot change—its anti-popular nature and aggressive propensities are too deeply ingrained. This is clear from the continuation of the arms race and the growth of military expenditure in NATO countries. In this aggressive bloc, military preparations are still going ahead and everything is done to subvert or delay detente. In order to progress towards durable peace and security, it is important to build up the anti-imperialist forces and step up the struggle against anti-communist ideology and policy.

To achieve new frontiers of detente in Europe and the whole world it is necessary to solve today's most urgent and pressing problem—to stop the arms race and secure disarmament (nuclear disarmament, above all), thus eliminating the threat of a world war. The socialist countries, by their very nature, are determined opponents of the arms race. Leonid Brezhnev observed: 'Many years ago, Lenin called disarmament "an ideal of socialism". There were no real prerequisites at that time for arresting

the growth of militarism and averting the menace of a world war. Today the situation has changed. The forces of socialism and peace wield such great influence that progress towards solving this cardinal task for mankind—at least gradually and in separate sectors—is becoming practically feasible.'*

The great historic mission of Soviet and socialist international policy is to preserve and strengthen peace, to assist all peoples in their struggle for independent development and inalienable right, to support the forces fighting against imperialism, exploitation and oppression in the name of freedom, democracy and socialism. Their foreign policy line is the embodiment of proletarian internationalism, of the Leninist ideas of equality among peoples and peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems. Such a policy is not only vital to the interests of the peoples in the socialist countries but also contributes to the common struggle of the communist and workers' movement and of all progressive forces for a happier future for mankind.

Socialism faithfully promises peace and the development of international cooperation on an equal footing. A lasting peace is the decisive condition of mankind's progressive development. 'Already today socialism exercises a tremendous influence on the thinking and sentiment of hundreds of millions of people all over the world. It assures working people freedom, truly democratic rights, well-being, the broadest possible access to knowledge, and a firm sense of security. It brings peace, respect for the sovereignty of all countries and equal inter-state cooperation, and is a pillar of support to peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. And the immediate future is sure to provide new evidence of socialism's boundless possibilities, of its historical superiority over capitalism. Along with the other fraternal parties, the CPSU will continue to do everything in order to enhance the appeal of the example of victorious socialism.'**

---

* *Pravda*, 26 October 1976.

** *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 13-14.

THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

The international working class is the leading force in the struggle against monopolies and imperialism. No other class or social section is so well-organised, consistent or strong.

In the days of the Paris Commune (1871) the world's working class was about 15 million. In the mid-1970s there were about 230 million workers in the industrialised capitalist countries, 150 million in the socialist countries and 200 million in the developing countries. According to estimates the working class will increase to somewhere between 1.2 and 1.6 thousand million towards the end of this century.

The current stage in the development of the international working class, a stage of increased activity, is characterised not only by numerical growth but also by major qualitative changes. A growing proportion of the working class is engaged in advanced industries and working with the latest kinds of machinery. This bears out the fundamental Marxist proposition that the 'ranks of the international working class, the most advanced revolutionary class of modern times, and its role as the main productive and socio-political force in the world, will continue to grow. Despite the fashionable anti-Marxist theories which allege that the scientific and technological revolution is narrowing the scope of the working class and even eliminating it altogether, the facts testify to the contrary: scientific and technological progress everywhere leads to the growth of the working class, due among other things to the new occupations introduced by the modern methods of production.'*

In modern capitalist society the working class remains exploited and oppressed. A growing intensification of labour, a decrease in real wages, widespread poverty, illiteracy, disease, the inner-city crisis, pollution of the environment—such are the conditions in which working

* L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 22.

people have to exist in the capitalist world. It is increasingly obvious that capitalism is a society without a future. Technological progress results in mass redundancies which threaten the entire socio-political system. Both prices and inflation continue to increase.

Contrary to the assertions of bourgeois ideologists state-monopoly regulation has failed to bring about 'social peace' and diminish the class struggle. The instability of capitalism is increasingly evident. There is absolutely no justification for the bourgeois and reformist denials that the material conditions of the working class and working people at large have become worse under modern capitalism and assertions that capitalism can be transformed into a society of equal opportunity. These ideas have been used to attempt to 'integrate' the workers into the state-monopoly capitalist system, imposing on them a 'social partnership' with the bourgeoisie and instilling in their minds the illusion that their basic interests could be met by the 'welfare state', with no need for class struggle or social revolution.

The working class counters the anti-labour policy of the monopolies and the state by stepping up its action against the chief cause of social calamities, big business. This can be seen from the scope of industrial action, which is now widespread in the capitalist world. The broader socio-political horizons and greater social activity of the working class promote the growth of its class consciousness and heighten its opposition to capitalist exploitation and social oppression, encouraging the growth of an anti-monopoly movement. The experience amassed by the working class improves its understanding of the complex mechanism of capitalist exploitation and the ties between the monopolies and the bourgeois state, suggesting more apposite forms of activity within the class struggle.

The increased role of the working class can be seen also in the fact that the working-class movement is growing not only in scope but also in depth. As it struggles against the monopolies to improve its living standards, the working class makes increasingly resolute demands for democratic reforms and a more equitable distribution of incomes, defending the right of the trade unions to take part in the organisation of labour and production and

their own right to make decisions on basic socio-economic problems. The broad masses come in time to realise that it is both necessary and possible to abolish the unlimited power of the monopolies. The working class also opposes the typically capitalist system of social relations and does so with increasing frequency.

The class struggle in the capitalist countries is fundamentally affected by the further development of imperialist integration, which makes concerted action by the proletariat necessary not only on a national, but also on an international, scale. The most enlightened workers and labour organisations support coordinated action by workers of different countries against the multinational corporations; they support greater international solidarity with the developing nations in their struggle for full political and economic independence and for the right to dispose of their own natural resources. They are also trying to solve the difficult problems of immigrant workers from a working-class standpoint.

Foreign workers, mainly those from the less developed countries, are being exploited on a hitherto unprecedented scale. Given the present internationalisation of economic activities, foreign manpower provides yet another link, a multilateral link, between national economies. In the more developed countries of Western Europe there are over ten million workers from countries such as Spain, Greece and Turkey, who are unfairly treated even when compared to the indigenous labour force.

The monopolists do their utmost to foster national and racial discord among the workers, while the working-class movement, striving to unite working people of all nationalities, demands the satisfaction of immigrant workers' needs, viewing this as part of the general struggle of the entire proletariat. The revolutionary working-class movement sees the extension of its work among foreign workers as necessary to raise the overall level of the class struggle on the national, regional and international plane. It proceeds from the belief that only by joint internationalist action on a class basis, 'only by casting off every savage and foolish national prejudice, only by uniting the workers of all nations into one association, can the

working class become a force, offer resistance to capitalism...'.*

The mass working-class movement in the advanced capitalist countries has begun to take more vigorous and purposeful action not only in home policy but also on urgent foreign policy issues, defending the principle of peaceful coexistence and cooperation between countries with different social systems, of strengthening and extending detente and of opposing the arms race. The working class also makes a great contribution to the struggle against aggressive tendencies in imperialist foreign policy; proletarian solidarity with the national liberation anti-imperialist movement is growing. The distinct and positive shifts that have occurred in the 1970s in the foreign policy of some West European countries and in the approach to problems of European security are to a large extent the results of the struggle conducted by the working class and other progressive social and political forces in the name of detente and lasting universal peace.

Contrary to the conceptions of the 'de-ideologisation' and 'depoliticisation' of the working class current in bourgeois political science, the level of political maturity and class consciousness of the working class have notably increased. The determined anti-fascist struggle waged by the working class and the solidarity of the workers and democrats of all countries was a major factor in eroding the Franco dictatorship in Spain and toppling the fascist regimes in Portugal and Greece.

The aggravation of the class struggle and the increasingly conflicting nature of social relationships are dramatically manifested in the stormy and often protracted socio-political crises occurring in Italy, Britain, France and other capitalist countries. Simultaneously there is a clearly observable slump in the prestige of the ruling circles in these countries. Contrary to the assertion that the workers will become 'dissolved' in a new intermediate stratum, they increasingly assert themselves as the main force of social development, expressive of the desire of the masses and the nation as a whole for social progress.

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'The Nationalisation of Jewish Schools', *op. cit.*, Vol. 19, Moscow, 1973, p. 308.

Marx and Engels wrote in the 'Communist Manifesto' that the proletariat would inevitably organise in a political party; this occupied an entire historical period. In the 1840s the communist movement encompassed merely three or four hundred people. At the beginning of the twentieth century in Russia there formed round Lenin a party of a new type, which initially united a mere handful of revolutionaries. In 1976 the 25th CPSU Congress was attended by 103 delegations from fraternal communist and workers' parties and from national liberation and revolutionary movements. The Congress demonstrated the triumph of socialist proletarian internationalism.

In 89 communist parties there are 76 million Communists, 40 million of them in the socialist countries and 36 million elsewhere. They represent the more politically conscious and mature part of contemporary society. In spite of their diverse circumstances and problems Communists in different continents are united into one universal international movement by the identity of their ideology—Marxism-Leninism, and the unity of their aim—the triumph of scientific socialism throughout the world.

The number of communist parties is steadily increasing and their social and political prestige is growing. During the 1960s and 1970s another fourteen communist parties were founded, increasing the total number of Communists by almost 20 million. The international cohesion and unity of Communists in the struggle against the common class enemy and in the name of common goals is growing.

Communist parties have formed and developed into well-organised and militant political groupings. They have headed a number of revolutions and have learned a lot through their struggle against opportunism, revisionism, anarchism and nationalism. Many of them are the ruling parties of socialist states; others lead popular movements in difficult circumstances, where capitalists, landlords and international reaction are supreme.

At different historical stages in the development of the international communist movement the communist and workers' parties engage in concerted action and intercourse and work out their common positions. Their reactions are specific at each stage. Recent years have

shown that, thanks to the increased maturity and experience of the communist movement, various international meetings and other new forms of contact between communist parties have proved effective in the anti-imperialist struggle in general and have also met the needs of each communist party in particular.

After the war the communist and workers' parties had international meetings in 1948, 1957, 1960 and 1969; each was an important landmark in the progress of the world communist movement. These meetings, devoted to the international consolidation of Communists in different countries, defined the concrete tasks to be faced at the current stage of the anti-imperialist struggle and also underlined the unity of action between communist and workers' parties and all anti-imperialist forces. The following slogan was put forward in 1969: 'Peoples of the socialist countries, workers, democratic forces in the capitalist countries, newly liberated peoples and those who are oppressed, unite in a common struggle against imperialism, for peace, national liberation, social progress, democracy and socialism!' This slogan has greatly contributed to the anti-imperialist struggle and to the greater unity and cohesion of the international communist movement.

The cooperation and international solidarity of Marxist-Leninist parties are seen in the expanding contacts between communist parties of different countries, for example, in bilateral, regional and multilateral meetings and conferences of communist parties convened to discuss concrete problems arising from their joint struggle, to share their experience and draw general conclusions therefrom.

The stronger unity and cohesion of the world communist movement was clearly seen at the Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe held in June 1976 in Berlin. Bourgeois ideologists attempted to prove that its collective deliberations (in the course of which various points of view were thoroughly clarified and a uniform attitude on pressing contemporary problems evolved) had in fact given rise to an irreconcilable conflict and thus heralded the end, or at least the beginning of the end, of the united communist movement. They

claimed that this movement is being superseded by regional variants such as 'Eurocommunism'.

The Conference convincingly showed that the idea of conflict between Communists from different countries was no less than a malicious fabrication. Against imperialism, the common enemy, which is doing its utmost to hold back revolutionary development, the Conference asserted its members' close cohesion in the pursuit of peace, democracy and socialism. In its final document 'For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe', the Conference noted that the international situation had essentially altered because the relation of world forces had turned towards peace, democracy, national liberation, independence and socialism and because the masses and various broadly based political and social forces were becoming increasingly active in this sphere. The Conference pointed out the historic significance of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in the further consolidation of peace and the fruitful development of relations among the European countries.

The Berlin Conference also stated that the democratic and anti-fascist struggle of the working class and the masses of Western Europe had risen to a higher level, one at which the working people were increasing their support of democratic reforms in every area of economic, social and political life, and against the very bases of monopoly domination.

The Conference outlined a programme to strengthen and extend detente by making effective moves towards disarmament and maintaining European security; to extirpate fascism and defend democracy and national independence; to develop mutually beneficial cooperation and better understanding between peoples; to aim for peace, security, cooperation and social progress all over the world. This programme has rallied all the progressive and peace-loving forces of Europe and the whole world.

The Conference indicated that the main revolutionary forces of today—the socialist countries, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement—were capable of overcoming reaction and averting a world war, if they acted jointly with all democratic forces for peace. European Communists have

emphasised that they repudiate any policy or ideology which implies the subjection of the working class to the capitalist system and have also indicated that the communist parties will develop their internationalist cooperation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Thus, the Berlin Conference aided the interaction of the fraternal parties of Europe, facilitating the establishment of an accepted code of mutual intercourse.

The Conference of Communist Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean, also attended by representatives from the Communist Parties of the United States and Canada and held in Havana in 1975, was likewise pervaded by the ideas of proletarian internationalism. The Declaration issued by the Conference stated: 'The revolutionary struggle in Latin America is a difficult and complex battle, with a place for all forces opposed to North American imperialism. The revolutionary movement must employ different forms and methods, correctly determining their place and time in accordance with the prevailing conditions in the countries concerned.'* The growing political struggle of the working class and its influence on all aspects of the anti-imperialist struggle on the American continent is now a major factor in Latin American life. The working class has increasingly emerged as the main driving force of national liberation in Latin America not only because of its size but rather because of its important role in social production and its growing class consciousness.

Stimulated by the Cuban revolution, the anti-oligarchical and anti-imperialist liberation movement is blazing new trails and leading the Latin American peoples towards democracy, independence and socialism.

The Declaration of the Havana Conference of Latin American Communists regarded the tasks of democratic solidarity and proletarian internationalism as part of the Latin American peoples' struggle for national and social emancipation. It noted especially that the Soviet Union and its Communist Party 'have always fulfilled and continue to fulfil brilliantly their duty of proletarian

* *Information Bulletin*, 12/1975, Prague, p. 46.

internationalism',* and that it was their support—as the First Secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba, Fidel Castro, said more than once—that had enabled the Cubans to establish socialism in their country, following their heroic struggle.

The communist movement and all Marxists-Leninists aim for the further consolidation of all Communists and all revolutionary forces and for a still more effective international policy. The adversaries of the international working class, on the contrary, aim to undermine proletarian internationalism and to reduce its effectiveness.

Bourgeois politicians and ideologists try to discredit proletarian internationalism and its principles in order to weaken the working people's internationalist solidarity. They allege that proletarian internationalism is no more than an excuse for certain larger parties to intervene in the affairs of the others. These assertions, however, are easily dismissed in the light of the actual relations between Communists of different countries. Proletarian internationalism is an organic combination of the mutual assistance and solidarity between fraternal parties with the principles of independence, sovereignty, equality and non-interference. To put the accent merely on recognition of sovereignty, equality and non-interference, without duly underlining the significance of solidarity and mutual support, would be to distort proletarian internationalism; it would also reduce the potential and undermine the strength of each individual fraternal party, for in fact mutual assistance and solidarity make it easier to defend each party's independence and help to build up its positions in the conflict with imperialism.

Attacks on proletarian internationalism are made, however, within the revolutionary working-class movement itself. Some people allege that the ideas of proletarian internationalism as they were taught by Marx and Lenin have become 'obsolete' and that proletarian, communist policy cannot have any common international foundation. Assertions of this sort have absolutely no basis in fact.

It is an important aspect of both the theory and the

---

* *Ibid.*, p. 50.

practice of proletarian internationalism that the experience accumulated by some national contingents of the revolutionary movement be correctly viewed by other contingents. One sometimes hears it said that the experience of the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, can hardly be used by other parties. In point of fact, Marxists-Leninists are and have always been against the mechanical application of one party's experience by other parties, for identical conditions cannot exist in different countries. The history, traditions and cultural individuality of any people cannot be ignored in transforming its society. It is not for nothing that Lenin stressed that 'Marx did not commit himself, or the future leaders of the socialist revolution, to matters of form, since form depends on the concrete situation'.* No truly Marxist-Leninist party presumes to foist its own experience onto other peoples; Communists proceed primarily from the general objective laws governing the development of the revolution and the building of socialism and communism.

Above all Marxists-Leninists approach problems, or any differences of opinion that may arise, from the standpoint of proletarian internationalism in order to strengthen the movement as a whole and they discuss and settle their problems in a spirit of genuine comradeship, equality and respect for the sovereignty of each party. It is certainly not a question of compromising on matters of principle or being conciliatory towards views or actions that contravene communist ideology—nor can it ever be. Leonid Brezhnev said: 'The experience of the struggle for the victory of the October Revolution showed that changes of tactics, compromises in order to win new allies, are quite possible in revolutionary practice. But we are also convinced of something else: under no circumstances may principles be sacrificed for the sake of a tactical advantage.

'The greater the influence of the communist parties, the more vigorously imperialism tries to divert the Communists from the correct path. This is done both crudely—by pressure and threats—and more subtly. There are now instances when the Communists in bourgeois countries are

* V. I. Lenin, '"Left-Wing" Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality', *op. cit.*, Vol. 27, Moscow, 1965, p. 343.

promised that their "right to a place in society" will be "recognised". A mere "trifle" is demanded in exchange: that they give up fighting the power of capital, give up the struggle for socialism, and abandon their international class solidarity. But the Communists won a place for themselves in society long ago. They won it precisely by their revolutionary struggle.'*

Especially stubborn class battles face the communist and workers' parties in capitalist countries where they are fiercely attacked by the reactionaries and made the principal target of anti-democratic laws and repressive measures. But despite this, Communists in these countries lead the larger and more militant industrial trade unions and communist parties are a political force to be reckoned with in many capitalist countries. Communist influence in some capitalist countries is such that the communist parties have seats in parliament and are broadly represented in local government bodies.

Communists do much to ensure unity of action between all contingents of the working class, engaging, for example, in active dialogue with socialist and social-democratic parties, and have made definite progress in a number of countries. 'Certainly,' reads the report of the CC CPSU to the 25th Congress, 'there can be no question of any ideological convergence between scientific communism and the reformism of the social-democrats. There are still too many among the social-democrats who base their entire activity on anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.... However, we can be and are united with social-democrats, conscious of their responsibility for peace, and all the more with social-democratic workers, by a common concern for the security of the peoples, a wish to contain the arms race, and to repulse fascism, racialism and colonialism. It is precisely on this plane that we displayed and will continue to display initiative and goodwill.'**

The communist movement has scored some major victories. Nevertheless, world imperialism has not ceased

---

* L. I. Brezhnev, *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress*, p. 25.

** *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 38-39.

to try to make up for lost ground. The governments of some capitalist countries hope to find a way out of their economic difficulties by veering to the right and letting loose militarist and pro-fascist forces.

Fascism is a weapon which imperialist reaction does not always use but always has in reserve, menacing democracy and peace. The forces of the old world are not going to surrender without a dogged and resourceful struggle. For this reason Marxist-Leninists proceed in everything they do from the need to appraise social processes strictly from a class standpoint, to be ever on their guard and to build up international solidarity, which is inseparable from the great struggle for peace and social progress.

THE PEOPLES' NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

An increasing role in modern world development and social progress is played by countries which until recently were colonial or semi-colonial, which are making a palpable contribution to the common struggle for peace, international cooperation, freedom and independence.

Proceeding from his analysis of imperialism as the last stage of capitalism, Lenin elaborated a comprehensive programme through which the international working class and all toiling and oppressed peoples of the world could destroy the imperialist colonial system and set up independent sovereign states in the place of colonies and semi-colonies.

During the first half of the twentieth century imperialism set up a capitalist world economy and evolved a system of exploitation in the colonies and semi-colonies which later became worldwide. The principal means of production, the transport system and communications were for the most part owned by foreign monopoly corporations. The growth of local craft industries was hindered. Exporting capital to enslaved countries and importing raw materials and products from them became an important part of the capitalist world economy in the imperialist stage.

The imperialist plunder of oppressed peoples prompted a strong wave of anti-colonial movements and national

liberation revolutions. After the October Revolution in Russia the colonial system of imperialism entered a period of profound crisis. The Soviet people's historic victory over fascism in the Second World War, the emergence of the socialist world system, and the upsurge of the international communist and working-class movements gave a strong impetus to the anti-colonial revolutions and movements which shattered the colonial system within two decades.

Just before the Second World War, in 1939, the colonies, semi-colonies and dependencies encompassed 66 per cent of the world's population. Early in 1977 the figure was less than one per cent; then there were 112 young independent states, of which 33 were in Asia, 48 in Africa, 26 in the Western hemisphere and 5 in Oceania. The overthrow of the fascist regime in Portugal in April 1974 brought about the end of the last colonial empire in the world.

After winning political independence, the young states had to take steps to ensure their economic, social and cultural progress. Today, the general crisis of capitalism seriously affects the capitalist world economic system built by imperialism and leads to changes in the relations between the imperialist powers and the young nations in such areas as foreign policy, economics, ideology and law.

Change in many young states can be seen mainly in the following areas: the shift of emphasis in industry to the public sector; the abolition of feudal landownership; the nationalisation of foreign-owned concerns aimed at bringing natural resources effectively under state control; and the training of local personnel. One of the principal areas in the struggle to shake off the hold of the big imperialist monopolies is the shift of emphasis in industrial growth to the public sector. In India, for example, the railways, the iron and steel industry, the defence industry, shipbuilding and aircraft construction, oil extraction and processing, and atomic power engineering are all in the public sector, which has become one of the key factors in stabilising the Indian economy. Major industrial projects completed or being built with Soviet cooperation are at the core of the public sector and contribute to India's economic independence.

In Burma basic industrial enterprises and electric power plants, transport, communications, the banks and insurance companies are owned by the state, which also controls foreign trade and runs numerous domestic trading concerns.

In Sri Lanka the public sector comprises the larger industrial concerns, for example, the steel rolling plant, tyre production, almost 90 per cent of the textile mills, and the whole of sea and railway transport and communications.

In their efforts to shake off imperialist exploitation and take charge of their national resources the young states rely on the support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The peoples of the recently liberated countries are impressed by the internationalist attitude of the Soviet Union and welcome economic cooperation with it. In 1955 the Soviet Union had economic and technological aid agreements with only two developing countries. In 1976, however, it had agreements with 56 Asian, African and Latin American countries. Cooperation with many of them—for example, with India, Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria and Ethiopia—is now on a continuous and regular basis. Between 1976 and 1980 cooperation will be conducted on a considerably larger scale. The Soviet Union will help construct key industrial projects in developing countries, mostly in the public sector.

Economic independence from imperialism essentially depends on agrarian reform. The abolition of feudal landownership helps eliminate the backwardness of the Asian and African countries with their millions of peasants and promotes the growth of agriculture. Another reason that the abolition of feudal landownership is so important is that peasants, who make up by far the larger part of the population in developing countries, are a major mass force, a potential ally of the proletariat in winning radical social and economic reforms.

In 1971 Algeria adopted an agrarian revolution law stipulating reforms which would necessarily lead to the elimination of big private landownership and to the development of cooperatives. In the first two stages of the revolution some state land was distributed, big private estates were curtailed and thousands of cooperatives of

various type were set up. November 1975 saw the third stage of the agrarian revolution, when cooperatives for pasture stock-breeding were established; this will be followed by the fourth and fifth stages, by which time the Algerian Government expects that the cooperative sector will be paramount.

The land reform in India undermined the foundations of the landowning system. Laws are now being considered to limit the size of landholdings and speed up the distribution of land surpluses, prohibit corvée, defer or nullify the debts of landless farm labourers and poor peasants and revise the rules on minimum agricultural wages.

Thoroughgoing agrarian reforms effected in Syria have dislodged the landlords from their dominant position. More than 1.5 million hectares of land were confiscated and distributed among 120,000 peasant families. Producers' cooperatives have been set up in practically every province.

In Burma peasants no longer have to pay rent to landlords and hundreds of thousands of landless peasant families have been allocated land. The Burma Socialist Programme Party is developing plans to extend the agricultural cooperative system as widely as possible throughout the country.

Sri Lanka's large tea and rubber plantations, most of them recently owned by foreign capitalists, have been taken over by the state. More than 500,000 acres of land were requisitioned from landlords in the course of the agrarian reform.

Most of the young Asian and African states are agrarian. Referring to the role of the colonial and dependent peoples, Lenin wrote that 'in the impending decisive battles in the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, initially directed towards national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism and will, perhaps, play a much more revolutionary part than we expect....

'Of course, there are many more difficulties in this enormous sphere than in any other, but at all events the movement is advancing. And in spite of the fact that the masses of toilers—the peasants in the colonial countries—

are still backward, they will play a very important revolutionary part in the coming phases of the world revolution.'*

Lenin's view has been confirmed by the development of anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movements. From peasant unrest in Indonesia and the Philippines, from the mainly agrarian anti-colonial movements early in this century, the peoples of the former colonies are now proceeding to an assault on the foundations of feudalism and capitalism.

Agrarian reforms play an important role in the dynamics of national liberation. In some liberated countries land cannot be bought or sold privately, while cooperatives are the leading form of organisation of production in agriculture. It is hoped that with their help the natural economy in these countries will be wane in importance as more staple crops are produced for the export market.

Agrarian reforms develop the peasants' initiative, helping to draw them into the revolutionary movement and thereby increasing their capacity to resist imperialism and domestic reaction. Peasant participation in the democratic movement is a major determining factor in the scope of national liberation and the rate of social and economic progress.

It is no simple matter to abolish feudal landownership and release poor peasants from feudal exploitation and bondage. In some countries government policy is resisted by rich peasants and sabotaged by officials. In India, for example, the landlords and rich peasants vigorously resist progressive measures to alter the pattern of agriculture. Big landowners often manage to conceal land surpluses from the authorities, to continue to exact corvée and to pay the labourers less than the prescribed minimum.

To end domination by foreign capitalists and win economic independence liberated countries establish their control over the natural resources and nationalise foreign-owned concerns. In this way they restrict and ultimately oust the monopolies. Between the mid-1950s and the

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Third Congress of the Communist International', *op. cit.*, Vol. 32, p. 482.

early 1970s more than two-thirds of the foreign-owned plantations and about a fifth of the foreign-owned trading concerns were nationalised. But most of the investments in the oil and mining industries in Asia, Africa and Latin America continued to be in Western hands.

The situation changed drastically in the early 1970s. Five major oil-producing countries—Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Abu Dhabi—declared that they would gradually increase their share in the oil companies from 25 to 41 per cent. Iraq nationalised the Iraq Petroleum Company, while in 1974 Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Kuwait nationalised 60 per cent of their oil industry capital assets.

The Algerian state-owned Sonatrach bought from the Compagnie française des pétroles a large part of its rights in oil extraction. The government of Qatar established control over the subsidiary oil monopolies operating in the country. In 1974 Nigeria bought out 55 per cent of the capital of the foreign oil companies there and in the same year Libya nationalised some foreign companies and acquired 51 per cent of the Libyan assets in Exxon and Mobil. In 1975 Venezuela nationalised its oil industry; in 1976 the iron ore extracting industry, which had formerly been in the hands of US monopolies, was similarly nationalised.

Zaire nationalised L'Union minière du Haut Katanga. The Zambian Government is gradually nationalising the copper industry, increasing the role of local representatives on foreign company boards and withdrawing the privileges of foreign companies.

The biggest bauxite producers—Jamaica, Guinea and Guyana—are raising the price of bauxite, simultaneously preparing to take a greater role in the bauxite extracting industry and for its prospective nationalisation.

By taking charge of the key natural resources and nationalising fully or partly the property of foreign monopolies the young states increase their economic potential and secure favourable conditions for the effective use of their own natural resources. In shaking off the monopolistic stranglehold, the developing countries not only establish their control over their natural resources but find it easier to establish and strengthen the public sector and carry out social reforms. This is, however, not

always the case. In Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, nationalisation of oil-producing and processing enterprises serves to enhance the sheikhdoms and build up opposition to revolutionary democratic movements in their own and in other developing countries. The local reactionaries join forces with certain imperialist circles and financial centres in the West in the same way and to the same end.

It is absolutely essential that developing nations have sufficient trained local personnel. Certain countries, especially those of a socialist orientation, follow the example of those Soviet republics which were culturally underdeveloped before the revolution and enjoy considerable help from the Soviet Union. Factories and other projects constructed with Soviet assistance in developing countries train large numbers of local people as steelworkers, engineering workers, electricians, construction workers and so on. Altogether more than 200,000 local skilled operatives and foremen have been trained on the job by Soviet specialists at building sites and in factories in the developing countries.

Thousands of Soviet vocational and secondary school teachers and college lecturers work in socialist-oriented developing countries. Hundreds of colleges, technical and general schools and training centres, including the Algiers National Oil and Gas Institute and the Polytechnic at Bahr Dar in Ethiopia were established with Soviet assistance. They have already graduated scores of thousands of urgently needed experts.

More than 150 of the leading Soviet factories run training programmes for foreign experts and operatives. Soviet colleges and universities are attended by students and postgraduates from many Asian, African and Latin American countries. Thousands and thousands of engineers, teachers, agronomists and scientists trained at Soviet colleges have now returned home and are working successfully there.

The governments of the young Asian and African states also concern themselves with ethnic problems, which is an important issue at this stage in the peoples' struggle to

better their conditions and is essential to a dialectical approach to life.

In many young states prominence is given to those demands which are linked to political or ethnic consolidation. To let this matter take care of itself would, in the African context, lead to fragmentation and the loss of newly won political independence.

Political and national consolidation in Asia and Africa proceeds in various ways. It would, for example, be wrong to say that the inhabitants of India make a single nation, as the Tamils differ considerably from the Bengalis, for instance. Yet there is something that makes both consider themselves to be Indians and not merely inhabitants of the same country.

It is no mere accident that many Asian and African governments stress the national consolidation of the entire population of the country, whatever the structure or complexity of its ethnic composition. Citizens are brought up to be aware of their national identity, not only of their tribal affiliation. Language and religion, which played such a prominent role in the emergence of the European nations, are rather less significant in many young states, since the emergence of national communities in the former colonies is entirely different from the comparable process in Europe. There national communities mainly developed at the same time as capitalism, and bourgeois relationships, which sprang up and took root in a struggle with feudalism, gave a strong impetus to the national formation processes. In most of today's modern industrialised countries, national consolidation was over by the time capitalism was established.

In the liberated countries consolidation arises from the struggle for political independence, which coincides with national development.* The task of building an independent multinational or national state with an independent viable modern economy is a stimulus strong enough to make people who speak different languages and belong to different tribes or ethnic groups wish to pool their efforts.

* Vestiges of tribalism persist in some African countries. Where the clan and tribal traditions are still strong and the chiefs are powerful, the government's pressure for change may lack mass support, a fact which the neocolonialists and reactionaries are quick to seize upon.

Today's national liberation, anti-imperialist movements are essentially different from national movements of the past. They are no longer local or isolated but make up one of the three strong revolutionary currents of the present epoch. Proceeding from a fight for national liberation, the peoples of former colonies, semi-colonies and dependencies are now ascending to new levels in the anti-imperialist struggle, attacking the foundations of the exploitative society. This anti-imperialist struggle waged by the liberated peoples may furnish the basis for the consolidation of a number of nations, nationalities and tribes into broader historical communities. It is a matter of concrete development of countries and of whole areas.

To quote an example, many socialist peoples of the Soviet Union have not consolidated into nations but this by no means prevents them from enjoying full equality and developing as an integral part of the new international community of peoples that the Soviet people constitutes.

Even in these recently independent countries which are multinational, the most widespread language usually becomes the lingua franca. In India, for exampe, the official languages are Hindi and, at the moment, English. In Indonesia the Indonesian language, although not spoken by any large ethnic group, is recognised as the official language and symbolises the unity of the state. At the same time numerous ethnic groups speak their native languages (such as Bengali, Telugu, Malayalam and Tamil which are spoken in India).

At the head of the national liberation movement are those Asian and African countries in which profound social upheavals and progressive economic and political changes are taking place, even though not necessarily on the same scale and in the same order. These countries are following the non-capitalist path and setting out to build a socialist society.

Countries with a socialist orientation represent an entirely new trend in the development of the young nations, a favourable trend for the mass of the people and one which leads to greater national independence. The experience of these countries is of exceptional significance. The more successful they are in developing their

economy, culture and science and in raising the living standards of the working people, the more attractive this path of development becomes to other Asian, African and Latin American countries.

The Soviet Union considers it particularly important to extend cooperation with socialist-oriented countries. This cooperation is of an internationalist character and proceeds on the basis of equality and mutual advantage.

The sovereign states which arose on the ruins of the colonial empires have become active in world affairs. They increasingly cooperate in order to consolidate their political independence and oppose colonialism, imperialism and neocolonialism. One important form of such cooperation is the essentially anti-imperialist movement of non-alignment. The concept of non-alignment was clarified at the Bandung Conference, where the heads of state of 29 Asian and African countries met in 1955. By 1978 five such conferences had been held, with a steadily growing number of participants.*

The non-aligned countries often hold bilateral and multilateral meetings at various levels to coordinate their efforts to strengthen political and economic independence and detente and combat colonial and racial oppression. The conferences often reaffirmed that in adopting a non-aligned stance they were trying to avert another world war and consolidate peace, to wipe out colonialism and neocolonialism, to remove conquest, violence and interference from inter-state relations, to uphold the principles of peaceful coexistence of countries with different socio-economic systems and to advocate general and complete disarmament, using part of the money which will thus become available to serve the cause of peace.

The movement consists of countries with various orientations in domestic and foreign relations, ranging from the socialist Cuba, Vietnam, Korea and Yugoslavia to the conservative Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. But the fact that almost 90 states have come

* The next conference of non-aligned nations, in 1961 in Belgrade, was attended by 25 countries. The 1964 Cairo Conference was attended by 47; the 1970 Lusaka Conference by 54; the 1973 Algiers Conference by 76; and the 1976 Colombo Conference by 86 countries.

together on the principle of non-alignment has certainly had a stimulating effect on the anti-imperialist national liberation struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The establishment in 1963 of the Organisation of African Unity was an important landmark in African national liberation. The activities of this organisation, on the whole, contribute to the consolidation of the political and economic independence of African countries and also increase their prestige on the world scene.

Marked positive changes have occurred in the foreign policy orientation of the League of Arab States which now increasingly concerns itself with the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggles in the Arab East.

Great changes are also taking place in the Organisation of American States, which was set up by the United States as an instrument of its expansionist policy. In the mid-1970s, the OAS Charter was revised and its members became free to establish diplomatic relations with Cuba, the first socialist republic in the Western hemisphere.

The main aim of the national liberation struggles from the first, and especially just after the last war, was to end colonialism and establish independent states. But when this aim had been more or less achieved, the centre of the struggle shifted to the drive for greater economic independence and sovereignty, for the eradication of the relics of the colonial and monopoly system of exploitation and for the establishment of independence of choice in social and political development.

The socialist world community plays a determining role in rendering international conditions favourable to such a struggle; its members base their relations with young states on principles of equality and mutual benefit. We read in the documents of the 25th CPSU Congress: 'It is quite clear now that with the present correlation of world class forces, the liberated countries are quite able to resist imperialist diktat and achieve just—that is, equal—economic relations.'*

In today's international situation the drive for economic independence objectively enhances internationalist anti-imperialist tendencies in national liberation movements

---

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU,* p. 16.

and helps to overcome disunity and develop relations with the socialist world and the international working class, both natural allies of the liberated countries. The Soviet Union's contribution to this issue is enormous: it helps by simply existing and thus demonstrating the superiority of socialism, by its foreign policy and military might and, finally, by its economic and technical assistance to the once oppressed peoples in the course of their emancipation from foreign exploitation and dependence.

The international cohesion of socialist and recently independent countries and all who are struggling against imperialism, reaction and war multiplies their aggregate strength many times over. 'The fighters for freedom have no easy way before them. They have to work hard to lay the foundations of the public economy required for socialism. Tough battles with the exploiting elements and their foreign patrons are inevitable. From time to time these result in zigzags in the policies of the young states and sometimes even lead to retreats. But the overall trend of development is incontestable. The will of millions of working people who have come to know what they are striving for and their place in life is a sure guarantee that national independence will be strengthened and that the social system free from exploitation and oppression will ultimately be victorious.'*

* L. I. Brezhnev, *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress*, p. 22.

CONCLUSION

For all our thinking and research this book has not provided a definitive answer to the problem it has concerned itself with—for there is no definitive answer.

Lenin's postulate of the inexhaustible nature of the atom and the electron, which has been confirmed in modern physics, carries profound scientific methodological significance. It applies at least equally to human society and history, which cannot be other than inexhaustible. And it is especially valid where it concerns contemporary national and international communities. Only by exercising a rigorously scientific approach to social phenomena can one form a correct idea of the diverse paths of development open to various peoples and see a link between past and present. Lenin considered a correct appreciation of the past as of the greatest importance, as instructive data on the basis of which we can proceed further.*

Students of primitive societies usually concentrate on the origins of one tribe or another or on the distinctions between socio-economic communities. This is certainly very interesting. But what is needed at present is a more detailed study of integration and syncretism—of contact, mutual influence and interaction. It is of still greater interest to predict the future development of these processes in communist society and the contribution each nation will make to the inexorable movement towards international unity.

---

* V. I. Lenin, 'Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), March 29-April 5, 1920', *op. cit.*, Vol. 30, Moscow, 1977, p. 445.

Consolidation processes have intensified in each age. The variety of intermediate transitional forms within the common forms of material culture is eloquent proof of an increasing interpenetration of both material and moral culture, of a sharing of the experiences and the tools of labour and of the mutual enrichment taking place in human society.

It has been incontrovertibly proved that all peoples, big or small, contribute, and have always contributed, to world history, to the march of social progress.

There was a time when progressive bourgeois ideologists supported the idea of the progressive development of humanity and its science and culture. But in the nineteenth century bourgeois social thought went into reverse, frightened by the possibility that social and democratic revolutions might strike at capitalist private ownership of the means of production. The objective approach to the development of society gave way to an apologia for capitalism.

Social progress is the result of the aggregate activities of all the tribes, peoples, nations and international communities of the world. The lessons of world history show that material and moral culture, although created by individual peoples, are an integral whole. This integrity, notwithstanding the uneven rate of world development, leads to more rapid progress in the economy, science and technology. Material production, communications and education are snowballing; all working people are striving to shake off their fetters and tear down the barriers between peoples.

Many bourgeois ideologists conclude that the scientific and technological revolution, with its acceleration of social change, is endangering the natural world and man's very existence. They maintain that atmospheric and water pollution, untrammelled urbanisation, the fear of nuclear war results from the current acceleration of universal material culture. And they believe that a major contributing factor to these unfortunate consequences of the technological revolution is the fact that moral progress has dropped hopelessly behind progress in science and technology. Man cannot cope with his own progress.

Other views on this issue also exist in the West. Progress

in science and technology is regarded as a great blessing which assures the satisfaction of every human need. Some sociologists and economists see future governments headed by a scientific-technical oligarchy, with the imposing figure of the engineer-intellectual, a child of the machine age, at the centre of society. But though they speak of the engineer as the priest and lord of the machine, bourgeois ideologists are terrified of that machine. Thus, they either say that progress should be halted, or they warn against it, or they draw awe-inspiring apocalyptic pictures. Their anxiety is easy to understand if one remembers that the development of modern society has raised the question of what is to be done with the redundant exploiting classes.

We Marxists are firmly convinced that the acceleration of progress merely speeds the realisation of ideals born long ago, ideals which are being consciously implemented in the socialist countries today. The current scientific and technological revolution is the result of the development of science and technology throughout the world in the latter half of the twentieth century. It is not by chance that this has coincided with the emergence of world socialism. The socialist system with its planned economy and regulated production—not only on a national but increasingly on an international scale—has replaced capitalist production. Achievements of the scientific and technological revolution have been united with the advantages of socialism.

Under developed socialism the revolution in science and technology is seen as a part of a vast whole, another Renaissance in the sense that it brings genuine regeneration to mankind. Marx and Engels foresaw it when they wrote that socialism implied the emergence of universal forms of association and that this 'will liberate the separate individuals from the various national and local barriers, bring them into practical connection with the production (including intellectual production) of the whole world and make it possible for them to acquire the capacity to enjoy this all-sided production of the whole earth (the creations of man)'.* The contemporary situa-

* K. Marx and F. Engels, 'The German Ideology'. In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, Moscow, 1976, p. 51.

tion exemplifies this very development in full swing.

Developed socialism and internationalism are indivisible and have identical philosophical, political, economic and class basis. They manifest a common ideology and policy, and give rise to the socialist community, a real, great community of peoples and an invaluable model of development for the non-socialist world.

Creative Marxism-Leninism is powerful precisely because it relies on the aggregate experiences of world history, on knowledge of the laws of society's development and on the rich material and moral culture created by man's labour and genius. Only by following the Marxist example and looking at human history as a whole, in all its complexity, can one build a bridge to the future and see clearly the best solution to the new and highly complex problems which face peoples in different continents as they fight for peace, freedom and independence, for social and economic progress and for socialism. This solution is found in internationalism, the fraternal cooperation of the socialist countries, the entire international working class and all the world's national liberation forces.

K. Marx and F. Engels, 'The German Ideology, Critique of Modern German Philosophy According to its Representatives Feuerbach, B. Bauer and Stirner, and of German Socialism According to its Various Prophets', Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, Moscow, 1976.

K. Marx and F. Engels, 'On Poland. Speeches at the International Meeting Held in London on November 29, 1847 to Mark the 17-th Anniversary of the Polish Uprising of 1830', Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Moscow, 1976.

K. Marx and F. Engels, 'Manifesto of the Communist Party', Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Moscow, 1976.

K. Marx and F. Engels, 'On the Polish Question. Speeches in Brussels, on February 22, 1848 on the Occasion of the Second Anniversary of the Cracow Insurrection', Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Moscow, 1976.

K. Marx, 'Inaugural Address of the Working Men's Association, Established September 28, 1864 at a Public Meeting Held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London', *The General Council of the First International, 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1974.

K. Marx, 'The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association', *The General Council of the First International, 1866-1868*, Moscow, 1974.

Karl Marx, 'Der Generalrat an den Föderalrat der romanischen Schweiz', Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels, *Werke* Bd. 16, Berlin, 1968.

K. Marx, 'Critique of the Gotha Programme', Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Volume 3, Moscow, 1976.

'Marx to Engels in Manchester, June 20, 1866', Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1975.

'Marx to Sigfrid Meyer and August Vogt in New York, April 9, 1870'; Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1975.

Friedrich Engels, 'Po und Rhein', Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 13, Berlin, 1969.

Friedrich Engels, 'Was hat die Arbeiterklasse mit Polen zu tun?' Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 16, Berlin, 1968.

Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring. Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science*, Moscow, 1969.

Frederick Engels, 'The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State in the Light of the Researches of Lewis H. Morgan', Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Volume 3, Moscow, 1976.

Friedrich Engels, 'Über den Verfall des Feudalismus und das Aufkommen der Bourgeoisie', Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 21, Berlin, 1962.

V. I. Lenin, 'What the "Friends of the People" are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats', *Collected Works*, Vol. 1.

V. I. Lenin, 'The Heritage We Renounce', *Collected Works*, Vol. 2.

V. I. Lenin, 'The National Question in Our Programme', *Collected Works*, Vol. 6.

V. I. Lenin, 'The Position of the Bund in the Party', *Collected Works*, Vol. 7.

V. I. Lenin, 'To the Jewish Workers', *Collected Works*, Vol. 8.

V. I. Lenin, 'On the Question of a Nation-Wide Revolution', *Collected Works*, Vol. 12.

V. I. Lenin, 'The Working Class and the National Question', *Collected Works*, Vol. 19.

V. I. Lenin, 'Draft Platform for the Fourth Congress of Social-Democrats of the Latvian Area', *Collected Works*, Vol. 19.

V. I. Lenin, 'Theses on the National Question', *Collected Works*, Vol. 19.

V. I. Lenin, 'Critical Remarks On the National Question', *Collected Works*, Vol. 20.

V. I. Lenin, '"Cultural-National" Autonomy'. *Collected Works*, Vol. 19.

V. I. Lenin, 'The National Programme of the R.S.D.L.P.', *Collected Works*, Vol. 19.

V. I. Lenin, 'Tezisy referata po natsionalnomu voprosu' (Theses of an Absract on the National Question), *Complete Works*, Fifth Russian Edition, Vol. 24.

V. I. Lenin, 'The National Equality Bill', *Collected Works*, Vol. 20.

V. I. Lenin, 'The Right of Nations to Self-Determination', *Collected Works*, Vol. 20.

V. I. Lenin, 'On the National Pride of the Great Russians', *Collected Works*, Vol. 21.

V. I. Lenin, 'Under a False Flag', *Collected Works*, Vol. 21.

V. I. Lenin, 'The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination', *Collected Works*, Vol. 21.

V. I. Lenin, 'The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination', *Collected Works*, Vol. 22.

V. I. Lenin, 'The Discussion On Self-Determination Summed Up', *Collected Works*, Vol. 22.

V. I. Lenin, 'A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism', *Collected Works*, Vol. 23.

V. I. Lenin, 'Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People', *Collected Works*, Vol. 26.

V. I. Lenin, 'Draft Programme of the R.C.P.(B.). Rough Draft of the Programme of the R.C.P.', *Collected Works*, Vol. 29.

V. I. Lenin, 'Speech Closing the Debate on the Party Programme, March 19 (Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) March 18-23, 1919)', *Collected Works*, Vol. 29.

V. I. Lenin, 'Report on the Party Programme, March 19 (Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) March 18-23, 1919)', *Collected Works*, Vol. 29.

V. I. Lenin, 'Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions', *Collected Works*, Vol. 31.

V. I. Lenin, 'The Second Congress of the Communist International. Report of the Commission on the National and the Colonial Questions, July 26', *Collected Works*, Vol. 31.

V. I. Lenin, 'The Question of Nationalities or Autonomisation', *Collected Works*, Vol. 36.

Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Moscow, 1977.

Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU. Moscow, 1976.

The Road to Communism. Documents of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. October 17-31, 1961, Moscow, 1962.

L. I. Brezhnev, *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress*. Report at a jubilee meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR to mark the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, November 2, 1977, Moscow, 1977.

L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles,* Moscow, 1972.

L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles (1972-1975),* Moscow, 1975.

L. I. Brezhnev, *On the Draft Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Results of the Nationwide Discussion of the Draft.* Report and Closing Speech at the Seventh (Special) Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Ninth Convocation, October 4-7, 1977, Moscow, 1977.

K. N. Brutents, *National Liberation Revolutions Today.* Vol. I-II, Moscow, 1977.

G. Glezerman, *Classes and Nations,* Moscow, 1979.

V. G. Trukhanovsky, *Winston Churchill,* Moscow, 1978.

R. Ulyanovsky, *National Liberation. Essays on Theory and Practice,* Moscow, 1978.

КПСС о формировании нового человека. Сборник документов и материалов (1965—1976). М., 1976.

О подготовке к 50-летию образования Союза Советских Социалистических Республик. Постановление ЦК КПСС от 21 февраля 1972 г. М., 1972.

50 лет образования Союза Советских Социалистических Республик. Совместное торжественное заседание ЦК КПСС, Верховного Совета СССР, Верховного Совета РСФСР 21—22 декабря 1972 г. Стенографический отчет. М., 1972.

Образование Союза Советских Социалистических Республик. Сборник документов. М., 1972.

XXV съезд Коммунистической партии Советского Союза. Стенографический отчет. В 3-х тт. М., 1976.

О 60-й годовщине Великой Октябрьской социалистической революции. Постановление ЦК КПСС от 31 января 1977 г. М., 1977.

Брежнев Л. И. *Ленинским курсом.* Речи и статьи. Т. 1—5. М., 1970—1976.

Брежнев Л. И. *Вопросы развития политической системы советского общества.* М., 1977.

Кириленко А. П. *Избранные речи и статьи.* М., 1976.

Косыгин А. Н. *Избранные речи и статьи.* М., 1974.

Кунаев Д. А. *Исторический опыт КПСС в борьбе за укрепление мира и дружбы между народами.* Доклад на Всесоюзной научно-теоретической конференции 1 июня 1977 г. М., 1977.

Суслов М. А. *Марксизм-ленинизм — интернациональное учение рабочего класса.* Статьи и выступления. М., 1977.

Суслов М. А. *На путях строительства коммунизма.* Речи и статьи. В 2-х тт. М., 1977.

Щербицкий В. В. *Международное значение опыта национальных отношений в СССР.* Киев, 1974.

Щербицкий В. В. *XXV съезд КПСС о совершенствовании социалистического образа жизни и формировании нового человека,* М., 1977.

Алиев Г. А. *Азербайджанская ССР в братской семье советских*

народов. Доклад на торжественном заседании ЦК КП Азербайджана и Верховного Совета Аз.ССР, посвященного 50-летию образования Аз.ССР и КП Азербайджана 2 октября 1970 г. Баку, 1975.

Алиев Г. А. *Великая Октябрьская социалистическая революция и национально-освободительное движение народов Азии, Африки, Латинской Америки.* Доклад на Международной научной конференции 26 мая 1977 г. М., 1977.

Актуальные вопросы теории национальных отношений. Вып. 2, М., 1970.

Актуальные проблемы истории советского рабочего класса. М., 1975.

Актуальные проблемы ленинского философского наследия. М., 1976.

Актуальные проблемы развития национальных отношений в СССР. Махачкала, 1973.

Аношкин И. Ф. *Интернационализм внутренней политики КПСС. (Из теоретического наследия В. И. Ленина).* М., 1975.

Антикоммунизм и ревизионизм на службе империализма. М., 1974.

Афтенюк С. Я. *Ленинская национальная политика Коммунистической партии и образование советской государственности молдавского народа.* Кишинев, 1971.

Баграмов Э. А. *Ленинская национальная политика: достижения и перспективы.* М., 1977.

Баграмов Э. А. *Национальный вопрос и буржуазная идеология. (Критика новейших политико-социологических концепций).* М., 1966.

Белоусов В. И. *Об интернациональном воспитании трудящихся.* М., 1972.

Братское единство народов СССР. Кишинев, 1976.

Братство народов и интернациональное воспитание. Материалы конференции. 1974.

Бодюл И. И. *Братское единство народов.* Кишинев, 1976.

Бромлей Ю. В. *Этнос и этнография.* М., 1973.

Бурмистрова Т. Ю. *Национальный вопрос и рабочее движение в России. (Ленинская политика пролетарского интернационализма. 1907—1917 гг.).* М., 1969.

Вопросы интернационального воспитания трудящихся. По материалам Всесоюзной научно-практической конференции в Тбилиси в октябре 1976 г. М., 1977.

Вопросы современной идеологической борьбы. Ашхабад, 1976.

Вопросы теории и жизнь. Сборник статей. Вып. 2—4. М., 1967—1977.

Годоев Х. *В семье единой и великой.* Душанбе, 1976.

Головнев А. И. *Интернациональное и национальное в развитии социалистической культуры.* Минск, 1974.

Голотвин Ж. Г., Мирский Р. Я. *Традиции советского патриотизма.* М., 1975.

Греков И. Б. *Очерки по истории международных отношений Восточной Европы. XIV—XVI вв.* М., 1963.

Грекул А. В. *Расцвет молдавской социалистической нации.* Кишинев, 1974.

Григулевич И. Р. *Инквизиция.* М., 1976.

Григулевич И. Р. *Крест и меч. Католическая церковь в Испанской Америке XVI—XVIII вв.* М., 1977.

Гришкявичус П. П. *В семье единой, братской.* Вильнюс, 1975.

Грошев И. И. *Борьба партии против национализма.* М., 1974.

Грошев И. И. *Исторический опыт КПСС по осуществлению ленинской национальной политики.* М., 1967.

Грошев И. И., Чеченкина О. И. *Критика буржуазной фальсификации национальной политики КПСС.* М., 1974.

Давляткадамов Х. Д. *Социально-классовые основы сближения социалистических наций.* Душанбе, 1976.

Дашдамиров А. Ф. *Нация и личность.* Баку, 1976.

XXIV съезд КПСС и проблемы научного коммунизма. М., 1973.

Джамгерчинов Б. *Марксистско-ленинское решение национального вопроса.* Фрунзе, 1976.

Джандильдин Н. Д. *Природа национальной психологии.* Алма-Ата, 1971.

Диалектика национального и интернационального в социалистическом образе жизни. Казань, 1976.

Диалектика национального и интернационального в строительстве социализма и коммунизма. Пермь, 1976.

Доронченков А. И. *Интернациональное и национальное в мировой социалистической системе.* Киев, 1975.

Единство и сотрудничество народов СССР. Кишинев, 1975.

Закономерности формирования советского народа как новой исторической общности людей. Т. 1—2. М., 1975.

Затеев В. И. *Национальные отношения при социализме. (Сущность, формирование, закономерности развития).* Улан-Удэ, 1975.

Иванов К. Серия статей «К социально-экономической характеристике современного колониализма». *Международная жизнь,* 1960, № 2, 6, 10; 1961, № 8.

Иванов К., Бацанов Б. *Взгляд в завтра.* М., 1963.

Идеологические проблемы научно-технической революции. М., 1974.

Интернациональная сущность научного коммунизма. М., 1977.

Интернациональное воспитание трудящихся. (Сборник). Махачкала, 1974.

Интернациональное и национальное в социалистическом обществе. Киев, 1976.

Интернациональный принцип в строительстве и деятельности КПСС. М., 1975.

Калтахчян Н. М., Калтахчян С. Т. *Ленинская теория наций и ее фальсификаторы.* М., 1973.

Калтахчян С. Т. *Ленинизм о сущности нации и пути образования интернациональной общности людей.* М., 1976.

Капырин П. И. *Органическое единство интернационализма и патриотизма.* М., 1973.

Караманов М. О. *Интернационализм и национализм.* М., 1971.

Кравец И. Е. *Пролетарский интернационализм, отечество и патриотизм.* Киев, 1965.

Ким М. П. *Советский народ — новая историческая общность людей.* М., 1972.

Кириченко М. Г. *Роль законодательства в национально-государственном строительстве Союза ССР.* М., 1974.

Критика буржуазных теорий национализма и расизма. М., 1976.

Куличенко М. И. *Национальные отношения в СССР и тенденции их развития.* М., 1972.

Куличенко М. И. *Укрепление интернационального единства советского общества.* Киев, 1976.

Кураганов Г. Г. *Пролетарский интернационализм в Великой Октябрьской социалистической революции.* М., 1967.

Кюзаджян Л. С. *Пролетарский интернационализм и мелкобуржуазный национализм.* М., 1968.

Лаврова Л. Ф. *Интернационализм советского народа. (Социальная активность масс в сфере международного социалистического сотрудничества).* Киев, 1975.

В. И. Ленин — великий теоретик. М., 1970.

Ленин, советское многонациональное государство. Махачкала, 1974.

Ленинизм — великое интернациональное учение. Высказывания деятелей братских коммунистических и рабочих партий о роли ленинизма как интернационального учения о международном значении опыта КПСС. М., 1973.

Ленинизм и национальный вопрос в современных условиях. Изд. 2-е, М., 1974.

Ленинизм и современная идеологическая борьба в национальном вопросе. М., 1970.

Ленинизм и современная идеологическая борьба в национальном вопросе. Материалы научной конференции: «Вопросы теории пролетарского интернационализма в документах и материалах Международного совещания коммунистических и рабочих партий», состоявшейся в 1970 году в г. Каунасе Литовской ССР. М., Каунас, 1970.

Ленинизм и теоретические проблемы современного социального развития. М., 1974.

Ленинская национальная политика и борьба против ее фальсификаторов. Ашхабад, 1975.

Ленинская теория культурной революции и современность. Л., 1973.

Ленинские принципы интернационального воспитания трудящихся. Кишинев, 1969.

Ленинские принципы интернационального воспитания трудящихся. Изд. 2-е, доп. Таллин, 1975.

Лепешкин А. И. *Советский федерализм. Теория и практика.* М., 1977.

Лычагин В. А. *Экономические проблемы развития наций и национальных отношений в СССР на стадии развитого социализма.* Саранск, 1975.

Манфред А. З. *Наполеон Бонапарт.* М., 1973.

Марксизм и наша эпоха. М., 1968.

Мартышин О. В. *Социализм и национализм в Африке. Очерки развития новейшей общественно-политической мысли в странах Африки.* М., 1972.

Матюшкин Н. И. *О социалистическом интернационализме.* М., 1969.

Матюшкин Н. И. *Патриотизм и интернационализм советского народа.* М., 1975.

Марпуль Г. С. *Торжество ленинской национальной политики и ее буржуазные фальсификаторы.* Минск, 1975.

Минкявичюс Я. В. *Католицизм и нация.* М., 1971.

Михайлов В. А. *Воспитание чувства интернационализма.* Львов, 1975.

Многонациональное советское государство. М., 1972.

Мординов А. Е. *Развитие В. И. Лениным идеологии и практики интернационализма.* Якутск, 1970.

Нагорная Л. А. *Расцвет и сближение наций в СССР на современном этапе.* Киев, 1975.

На путях нерушимой дружбы. Материалы всесоюзной научной конференции «Историческое значение установления дружбы и сотрудничества между СССР и социалистическими странами Европы». Москва, 24—25 февраля 1975, М., 1977.

Насиров Г. *Единство советского патриотизма и социалистического интернационализма.* Баку, 1972.

Национальное и интернациональное в жизни народа. (Материалы межреспубликанской научной конференции. Вып. I. Проблемы соотношения национального и интернационального. Вып. 3. Национальное и интернациональное в строительстве коммунизма. Вып. 4. Социалистический интернационализм и мировой революционный процесс). Киев, 1970.

Национальное и интернациональное в идеологии национально-освободительного движения. Тезисы. М., 1974.

Национальное и интернациональное в литературе, фольклоре и языке. Кишинев, 1971.

Национальные отношения в развитом социалистическом обществе. М., 1977.

Национальные отношения и государство в современный период. М., 1972.

Новая историческая общность людей: сущность, формирование, развитие. М., 1976.

Образование СССР — торжество ленинской национальной политики. Пятигорск, 1972.

Опыт и проблемы интернационального и атеистического воспитания. М., 1976.

Осуществление принципов интернационализма в национальной политике КПСС. М., 1975.

Образование и развитие СССР — торжество ленинской национальной политики КПСС. Минск, 1974.

Партия и социалистическая культура. XXIV съезд КПСС и проблемы духовной культуры социализма. М., 1972.

Под знаменем интернационализма. Тбилиси, 1975.

Под знаменем пролетарского социалистического интернационализма. Киев, 1974.

Под знаменем социалистического интернационализма. Львов, 1974.

Под ленинским знаменем социалистического интернационализма. Баку, 1972.

Пригодий М. И. *Братское единение художественных культур народов СССР.* Киев, 1976.

Проблемы коммунистического движения. Ежегодник, 1974. М., 1974.

Проблемы развития и сближения культур, литературы, искусства стран социалистического содружества. Материалы научной конферен-

ции «Развитие и интернациональное содружество социалистических наций». М., 1974.

Проблемы теории и практики развитого социализма. М.— Прага, 1977.

Проблемы укрепления единства социалистических стран: сочетание национально-государственных и интернациональных интересов. М., 1972.

Пролетарский интернационализм — идейное знамя современного рабочего движения. Тбилиси, 1975.

50 лет СССР — торжество ленинской национальной политики. Материалы Всесоюзной научной конференции. Секция «50 лет СССР и актуальные проблемы общественного развития». М., 1973.

Рабочий класс СССР и его ведущая роль в строительстве коммунизма. Вып. I. М., 1974.

Раджабов С. А. *Образование и развитие СССР — торжество ленинской национальной политики.* Душанбе, 1973.

Развитие марксистско-ленинской теории в материалах XXV съезда КПСС. М., 1976.

Развитие национальных отношений в зрелом социалистическом обществе. Пятигорск, 1974.

Расцвет экономики и культуры Молдавии — торжество ленинской национальной политики. Кишинев, 1975.

Расы и народы. Современные этнические и расовые проблемы. Ежегодник. М., 1971—1977.

Реальный социализм в СССР и его буржуазные фальсификаторы. М., 1977.

Рогачев П. М., Свердлин М. А. *Нации — народ — человечество.* М., 1967.

Рогачев П. М., Свердлин М. А. *Патриотизм и общественный прогресс.* М., 1974.

Росенко М. Н. *Патриотизм и общенациональная гордость советского народа.* Л., 1977.

Росенко М. Н. *Сотрудничество и сближение наций в СССР в условиях развитого социалистического общества. (Экономико-социологическое исследование).* Л., 1974.

Русский язык — язык межнационального общения и единения народов СССР. Киев, 1976.

Рыбаков Б. А. *Культурные связи народов Восточной Европы в XVI в.* М., 1976.

Садыков М. Б. *Единство интернациональных и национальных интересов в советском многонациональном государстве. Теоретико-методологические проблемы.* Казань, 1975.

Селезнев Л. И. *Национально-освободительные революции современной эпохи.* Л., 1972.

Семенов В. С. «Распад колониальной системы империализма и вопросы международных отношений». *Коммунист,* 1956, № 18.

Серова И. И. *О пролетарском интернационализме.* Минск, 1970.

Серцова А. П. *Социализм и развитие наций. Об опыте СССР и ЧССР.* Москва, 1973.

Сибирь интернациональная. (Сборник). Новосибирск, 1972.

Слепов Л. А. *Ленинская партия — партия пролетарского интернационализма.* М., 1970.

Советский народ и диалектика национального развития. Баку, 1972.

Советский народ — новая историческая общность людей. Становление и развитие. М., 1975.

Советский народ — новая историческая общность людей. Ч. 1—2. М., 1976.

Советский народ — строитель коммунизма. Материалы всесоюзной научно-теоретической конференции. Фрунзе, 1977.

Современное революционное движение и национализм. М., 1973.

Современные этнические процессы в СССР. М., 1975.

Солодков Т. Е. *Полувековой опыт СССР и современный мир.* Минск, 1975.

Социализм и демократия. М., 1976.

Социализм и нация. Материалы международной конференции «Развитие и интернациональное сотрудничество социалистических наций», проведенной 23—24 окт. 1973 г. в гор. Москве Академией Наук СССР, Институтом марксизма-ленинизма при ЦК КПСС, Академией общественных наук при ЦК КПСС и Высшей партийной школой при ЦК КПСС совместно с научными и учебными заведениями стран социалистического содружества. М., 1975.

Социалистический интернационализм в действии. М.—София, 1974.

Социалистический образ жизни и вопросы идеологической работы. М., 1977.

Старушенко Г. Б. *Нации и государство в освобождающихся странах.* М., 1967.

Степанян С. *Интернационализм — основа национальной политики КПСС.* М., 1967.

Сужиков М. М., Демаков Г. А. *Влияние подвижности населения на сближение наций.* Алма-Ата, 1974.

Тавадов Г. Т. *Строительство коммунизма и развитие национальных отношений.* М., 1973.

Тадевосян Э. В. *Советская национальная государственность.* М., 1972.

Тадевосян Э. В. *В. И. Ленин о государственных формах решения национального вопроса в СССР.* М., 1970.

Таирова Г. Е. *Социалистическая интернационалистская идеология.* Минск, 1974.

Теоретические вопросы социалистического интернационализма. (Материалы Всесоюзной конференции). Вып. 1., М., 1968.

Теоретические вопросы пролетарского интернационализма. Редколлегия: М. С. Джунусов и др. М., 1972.

Тихомиров М. Н. *Древняя Русь.* М., 1975.

Торжество ленинской национальной политики. Куйбышев, 1974.

Торжество ленинской национальной политики. Алма-Ата, 1973.

Усубалиев Т. У. *Дружба народов — наше бесценное завоевание.* М., 1977.

Усубалиев Т. У. *Интернациональное воспитание трудящихся. (Идеологическая работа: опыт, проблемы).* М., 1974.

Усубалиев Т. У. *Ленинизм — великий источник дружбы и братства народов.* Изд. 2-е, доп. М., 1974.

Учение и дело В. И. Ленина — бессмертны. М., 1975.

Фасев К. Ф. *На путях пролетарского интернационализма.* Казань, 1971.

Федосеев П. Н. *Великий интернациональный подвиг советского народа.* М., 1973.

Федосеев П. Н. *Марксизм в XX веке. Маркс, Энгельс, Ленин и современность.* М., 1972.

Ханазаров К. Х. *Решение национально-языковой проблемы в СССР.* М., 1977.

Хейфец А. Н. *Советская дипломатия и народы Востока, 1921—1927.* М., 1968.

Холмогоров Л. И. *Интернациональные черты советских наций. (На материалах конкретно-социологических исследований в Прибалтике).* М., 1970.

Цамерян И. П. *Закономерности изменения национальной структуры советского общества.* М., 1976.

Целищев Н. Н. *Пролетарский интернационализм — идеология и политика социализма.* Свердловск, 1976.

Черепнин Л. В., Соловьев С. М. *История России с древнейших времен.* М., 1962—1966.

Чугаев Д. А. *Коммунистическая партия — организатор Союза Советских Социалистических Республик.* М., 1972.

Чхиквишвили Д. И. *Социализм, нация и культура.* Тбилиси, 1972.

Шевелев А. Г. *Современная эпоха и пролетарский интернационализм.* Л., 1975.

Шермухамедов С. *Расцвет и сближение национальных культур народов СССР.* М., 1974.

Шерстобитов В. П. *Советский народ — монолитная общность строителей коммунизма.* М., 1976.

Шитов Н. Ф. *Ленин и пролетарский интернационализм. (1917—1924).* М., 1974.

Шитов Н. Ф. *Развитие В. И. Лениным идеологии и политики пролетарского интернационализма (1884—1907 гг.).* М., 1966.

Экономические основы развития сотрудничества народов СССР. М., 1974.

Якубовская С. И. *Развитие СССР как союзного государства. (1922—1936 гг.).* М., 1972.

Якубовский А. Ю., Греков Б. Д. *Золотая орда и ее падение.* М.-Л., 1950.

INDEX

A

Anti-colonial struggle—80, 139, 283
Anti-Fascist Resistance Movement—190, 192, 193, 195, 196, 197

B

Beginning of human history—17, 18
Bourgeois nationalism—6, 74-75, 107
Bourgeois revolution in England—38, 39

C

Capitalism—70, 71-72, 73, 77-79, 101, 109, 112
Centralised state—32, 33, 37, 42, 49
Clan—20, 26
Colonialism—58, 63, 84-85, 86, 87, 91-92
Communist International—135-137, 170-172
Consolidation processes in world history—5, 13, 15, 52
— in Asia—52-57, 58-65, 92
— in Africa—52, 94-95
— on the American continent—65-67, 95, 132
Council for Mutual Economic Assistance—254-259

D

Decree on Peace—116, 117-118
Developed socialism—198, 202, 203, 204-205, 227, 289

E

English bourgeois revolution—38, 39
Establishment of the Soviet Union—149-150, 152
Ethnic groups—5, 23, 24

F

Federation of tribal unions—20, 21
'Feudal nationalism'—81-83
Feudalism—25, 29, 38, 45, 46, 50, 58, 64
First World War—106, 166

G

Great French Revolution—34-37
Great October Socialist Revolution—15, 115, 116, 138, 149, 166, 238, 239
Great Patriotic War of the Soviet People—9, 15, 179, 180-187, 188

H

Homo habilis ('handy man')—16
Homo sapiens ('intelligent man')—16, 19
Horde—20, 26

I

Imperialism—85, 86, 88-89, 90, 101, 108-109, 239, 240, 275
Imperialist integration—241, 242, 243
International Movement of Solidarity with Soviet Russia—133-136

M

Militarism—243, 244

N

National question—7-9, 26
National self-determination—108, 123-125
Nationalism of an oppressed nation—6, 7, 76
Nationalities—5, 28
Nations—5, 6, 26, 70, 107
— capitalist—26, 28
— socialist—26, 149-150, 161-163
Non-capitalist development—140-143

P

Peasant revolts—29, 30, 31, 40, 41, 49
Proletarian internationalism—5, 6-7, 11, 99-100, 109, 111, 113, 114, 271-272, 273, 289
Proletarian solidarity against fascism—170, 172, 173

R

Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany—41, 42
Russian language—222-227

S

Second World War—166-167, 176, 177, 178-179
Slave-owning system—23, 24
Socialist integration—246, 247
Socialist world system—9, 10, 250-251
Soviet people as a new historical community—9, 212, 229, 232, 235

T

Tribe—20, 26

W

Working class—96, 97, 98, 110, 111, 164, 165, 264-266

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.